Slaying the Leviathan:
Catholicism and the Rebirth of European Conservatism, 1920-1950

James Chappel

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy
In the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

2012

ABSTRACT

Slaying the Leviathan:
Catholicism and the Rebirth of European Conservatism, 1920-1950

James Chappel

This dissertation argues that Catholic social scientists were the key theorists and designers of the post-1945 Western European order. Between 1920 and 1950, Catholics transformed from reactionary monarchists into Christian Democrats—a transition that has yet to be convincingly explained. The answer, I argue, should be sought at the level of social thought: following a number of anthropologists and political scientists, I suggest that modern governance is related far more closely to social theory, and social science, than it is to political theory, narrowly understood. Catholics lacked a genuine political theory, but they did not lack a sociology—and it is the latter that is required to govern a modern state. Following this insight, my research uncovered the forgotten universe of Catholic social science, showing how it was produced in the interwar years and put into practice after 1945.

I trace three figures as exemplars of three different regional traditions: Jacques Maritain (France), Waldemar Gurian (Germany), and Eugen Kogon (Austria). Their stories of exile, incarceration, and furious intellectual production are paradigmatic of Europe's tragic century. Each of them began on the authoritarian right wing, suffered at the hands of Nazism, and emerged after 1945 as leading lights of the Christian Democratic culture that remade Western Europe. The dissertation traces their stories in deep context as a way to reconstruct the social-scientific, transnational imagination of interwar Catholicism. This methodology allows us to see how European Catholics, faced with interwar crisis, developed theories of economic growth and political order that were just as sophisticated as anything on offer from socialists or liberals. In the end, it was more influential as well—the European welfare state, after all, was born under Catholic auspices.

The fundamental insight of Catholic social thought was that the state must devolve its authority to a complex of subsidiary and super-national institutions: families, Churches, professions, and charity organizations were to be charged with social welfare, while international institutions guarded international peace from power-hungry nation-states. In the interwar period, marked by *étatiste* projects of social-economic modernization, Catholics were left in the cold. World War II, however, changed everything. It did not simply alter political borders: crucially, it affected the very norms of international political and economic governance. While the state retained a great deal of political and economic power, its monopoly on sovereignty was chastened by a constellation of new institutions: the Marshall Plan, the UN, NATO, and European federalism appeared above the state, while the states themselves abjured mass nationalizations and supported subsidiary institutions (churches, families, regions) as delivers of welfare.

Taking advantage of this new configuration of power, Christian Democratic parties rose to power across the continent and ensured that European reconstruction rehabilitated the nuclear family, empowered international and subsidiary institutions, and avoided large-scale nationalization of industry. In other words, the geopolitical arrangement of the late 1940s allowed Catholics, in alliance with American political-economic might, to come to power and put their social-scientific principles into practice through the creation of new social market economies. European Catholics had spent the interwar years calling for a new Christendom, organized according to social Catholic principles. My dissertation suggests that, after 1945, they found one.

The research contained in this dissertation draws on research from over a dozen archives and more than seventy periodicals and newspapers. This capacious source base allows for a reconstruction of the transnational network of Catholic knowledge production across, primarily, France, Germany, and Austria, but also into Switzerland, Italy, Iberia, and the Atlantic World more broadly. This is the broadest source base in any study of modern European Catholicism, and this

dissertation provides the most comprehensive study to date of Catholic political culture in twentieth-century Europe.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

It is customary to begin the acknowledgments by pointing out that, despite the writer's belief that the dissertation would be a long and lonely process, it was in fact a deeply communal experience. This is true, but only to a point: writing a dissertation, as anyone would attest outside the confines of the "acknowledgments" genre, is a solitary experience, characterized more by lonely nights tapping away than convivial bull sessions. I say this not in order to diminish the assistance of others, but to point out its true significance. The aid I've received has been like bright stars of compassion in the dark night of dissertating. For all of it I am truly grateful.

I'll begin with the teachers that led me to history and to my topic in the first place. First and foremost I must thank Linda Gerstein, my undergraduate mentor, who brilliantly showed me that history was the royal road to the life of the mind. It could be, that is, everything that I was casting about for as an undergraduate: insight into meaning, into social practice, into human relationships, into ideas. She showed me that the past is another world, and one that is not even past. I should thank my students at Shanghai High School, who suffered through my early attempts at history lecturing as I came to the conclusion that I had a genuine love for teaching history—it was this experience that led me to graduate school. At Columbia, I have had the privilege of working in an extraordinarily dynamic and exciting place to study European history. Volker Berghahn introduced me to European historiography; Mark Mazower taught me what it is to read like a historian. Carol Gluck nursed me through the emotional crisis that is perhaps the only mandatory feature of graduate education (surely one can get out of orals somehow?). Pierre Force introduced me to political economy, and, along with Fred Neuhouser, taught me to read as a philosopher; Harry Harootunian rekindled my waning faith that history can have a political conscience (or was that a political unconscious?). Paul Hanebrink was incredibly generous with his time and expertise—this would be a completely different work without his guidance.

I have been blessed with two superb advisers: my debt to Samuel Moyn and Susan Pedersen is incalculable. Intellectually, they molded my occasionally unyielding clay into a shape resembling a genuine historian. Professor Moyn is the most perceptive reader, of my own work as well as that of others, that I have encountered, and he has shown me, through his pedagogy and his own scholarly example, how to bring intellectual history into dialogue with other forms of history and other disciplines. Professor Pedersen, through her own example and through her near-horror at my utter ignorance of so many topics, has lit a fire under me that, I hope, never goes out. Her indelible example has shown me the *frisson,* however unfashionable, of dense archival work and institutional awareness (how *does* the electoral system of the Third Republic work?). The intellectual side is only half of the adviser's task, and Moyn and Pedersen shined at the administrative sides as well. This may sound minor, but any graduate student will attest that it is not.

Despite the popular misconception, a dissertation is not primarily an intellectual project, but an institutional and financial one: a thick network of institutions and funders is necessary to keep the dissertator in the archive. Columbia University has been a constant supporter, of course, providing enough summer funding and teaching stipends to keep me float. The German Academic Exchange Service [DAAD] sent me to Dresden for some much-needed language training, while the American Theological Librarianship Society supported my early efforts to chart the landscape of religious publishing. The Council for European Studies, through its pre-dissertation grant and its conference invitations, helped me in the fragile early stages of defining my project. The Social Science Research Council supported a year of research abroad, while the Consortium for Intellectual and Cultural History supported me for a summer as I tried to make sense of what I had found.

That said, a dissertation is *also* an intellectual project, and over the years innumerable people have helped me track down sources, corrected my errors, and suggested new avenues for exploration. I am grateful to audiences at the "Katholische Publizistik im 20. Jahrhundert"

conference at the University of Eichstätt, a warm audience at the European Social Science History Conference, and another at Cambridge University's Political Theory and Intellectual History Workshop. Multiple commenters, particularly Udi Greenberg and Anson Rabinbach, provided some stellar insights at the German Studies Association, while another cluster of professors helped me at Columbia's European History Workshop. In the key late stages of the writing, an interdisciplinary audience at the Institute for Social and Economic Research and Policy helped me to think more broadly about my evidence and conclusions (William McCallister is specifically to be thanked here). Lastly, the Remarque Institute, again in the key last phases of writing, invited me to a Kandersteg Seminar on Religion—an unforgettable experience that helped my theoretical concerns snap into focus at just the right time (discussions here with Piotr Kosicki, amongst others, were extremely useful and enjoyable).

The raw material of a dissertation comes, again, not from one's head but from arcane institutions known as libraries. I am grateful to the many librarians, too many to list here, who have supplied me with a steady stream of books, journals, inter-library loans, and more. I am particularly grateful to the archivists at the Institut für Zeitgeschichte in Munich, the Landesarchiv Nordrhein-Westfalen, the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung in Bonn, Erzbistum Köln, the Jacques Maritain Center at the University of Notre Dame, and the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, also in Munich. Special mention should be made of the Cercle d'études Jacques et Raïssa Maritain in Kolbsheim, where I was the recipient of extremely generous hospitality—and intellectual stimulation—from René Mougel.

Dissertations are a financial and intellectual struggle, yes, but also an emotional one: dissertating, to repeat, is a lonely experience, and a support network of friends, family, and pets is the only thing that keeps one from collapsing into a puddle of footnotes. I will err on the side of brevity here, but Adam Bronson and Simon Taylor, in particular, are worthy of thanks. During my research trips I was lucky enough to find sympathetic expatriates: Andy Denning, Phil Fileri and

Steve Milder stand out here. The debt I owe to family is such that it feels wrong to even mention it in a dissertation as shot through with flaws as this one surely is. They produced a person, not a dissertation (while the person is doubtless as flawed as the dissertation, responsibility for remaining errors must be my own). Suffice it to say that without Mom and Dad, Becky and Murray, Nana and Pup-pup, Momo and Granddad, Mortimer and Olive, Mary and Bethany, this dissertation would not exist.

For my parents

We'll be utilitarian, military, American and Catholic. Very Catholic! You'll see!

--Gustav Flaubert, predicting the future to George Sand, 27 November 1870

Introduction

It is indeed possible that when everything has finally been destroyed, power will fall to the Catholics. However, that will probably not happen quickly.
--Paul Adams, 1926[1]

A good Christian is, unbeknownst to himself, a liberal.
--Wilhelm Röpke, 1944[2]

When the dust settled on Europe after World War II, the Europe that remained bore little resemblance to its predecessor. The culture and social order of pre-1939 Europe had been decimated just as much as its industrial and military resources. As breadlines lengthened and acrimonious trials continued, it seemed that the continent was headed towards decades of misery. This did not happen—at least not in the West. Surprisingly, Western Europe after 1945 experienced decades of runaway economic growth and political stability. Perhaps the devastation was not as total as once thought: the seemingly crushed economies righted themselves with stunning speed, and Europe as we know it was born.

But what of culture, and specifically political culture? If the economic recovery required the survival of resources, organizations, and expertise from the prewar era, was this not also true of ideology? Most historians have thought not: the robust belief in parliamentary supremacy and legitimacy has most often been explained as a novel feature of the post-1945 landscape, a product of the prestige of wartime democracy and the power of American arms. Europeans, the familiar story goes, were simply tired of ideology and retreated from the trumpet blasts of violent belief to the familiar environs of familial and village life. The family and the local were celebrated *ad nauseam*, while the "totalitarian state" of left and right was criticized as a Leviathan of bureaucratic despotism,

---

[1] Paul Adams to Erik Peterson, 14 October 1926, quoted in Barbara Nichtweiß, "Apokalyptische Verfassungslehren: Carl Schmitt im Horizon der Theologie Erik Petersons", in Bernd Wacker, ed., *Die eigentlich katholische Verschärfung* (München 1994), 37-88, here 85.

[2] Wilhelm Röpke, *Civitas Humana* (Zürich, 1944), 18.

denying the eternal dignity of the human person. As a continent, Europe retreated from Hitler and Mussolini to Pushkin: "My greatest wish, a quiet life/And a big bowl of cabbage soup."

This does seem, at first glance, like a reasonable response to the horrors of war. As millions of soldiers scrambled back to their homes, unaware if their family was alive or what they would eat if they were, the fate of their race and class was not foremost in their mind. But just as matériel and expertise survived from prewar decades, one cultural-political institution, above all, emerged from the wreckage to take a surprising leadership role: the Catholic Church. The Church was everywhere after 1945, enjoying renewed prestige and authority. Charles de Gaulle, Robert Schuman, Konrad Adenauer, Ludwig Erhard, Alcide de Gasperi, Leopold Figl (chancellor of Austria, 1945-53), and many other founders of the new Europe were unabashedly Catholic. Their religion entered the public sphere in a way that would have been inconceivable in the 1920s. The most obvious example of this is the new hegemony of a political movement that dominated the post-1945 decades in Western Europe more than any other: Christian Democracy.

Christian Democracy is the greatest political success story of twentieth-century Europe. Even in Germany and Italy, Christian Democrats ruled for far longer than their more familiar predecessors, while the support of the Catholic masses for democratic parties and governments is among the most salient social-political phenomena of the century. The trajectory and origins of the movement, however, remain little understood. Christian Democrats, who preached a fundamentally conservative and localist ideology, are simply seen as the political exponents of the new anti-ideological tenor of the times.[3] Those historians who have sought its origins implicitly legitimate this narrative by looking exclusively at those predecessors that resemble Christian Democracy most

[3] This is the basic story we get from the most influential synoptic accounts of modern European history: Tony Judt, *Postwar* (New York, 2005), 80-82, 260-77; Mark Mazower, *Dark Continent* (New York, 2000), 89-91.

superficially: those Catholics, vanishingly small in number, who actively supported parliamentary government in the 1920s and before.[4]

It is, to be sure, widely recognized that Western Europe was reconstructed in a peculiarly conservative key. The Resistance had nourished utopian dreams of a new and socialist Europe that would arise from the ashes of war. In the cold light of day, geopolitical realities kept this from happening, as anti-Bolshevik fervor, stoked by American armies and Marshall funds, kept Communists from power and broke the back of the left. As Charles Maier, Philip Nord, Susan Pedersen, Richard Vinen, and others have shown, the post-1945 welfare state was primarily a creation of bourgeois conservatism and traditional elites. Especially on the continent, its roots lie in anti-Bolshevism and the technocratic circles of the 1930s, not in the fiery rhetoric of the trade unions or the Resistance. As Maier in particular has argued over the decades, there was a fundamental similarity between the economic stabilizations of the post-WWI and post-WWII periods: both times, socialist demands were defused through a neo-corporatist gambit of collective-bargaining and interest-group politics, mediated by the state.[5]

The shocking transformation of Catholic political culture, though, remains unexplained. Catholics had been, for decades, rabid opponents of modern European parliamentary democracy—opponents, that is, of the very Europe that they were soon to celebrate and, to a large degree, create. In the 1920s and 1930s, most Catholics had supported authoritarian political solutions. Indeed, just as Christian Democracy was the default political option for post-1945 Europe, Catholic authoritarianism was, for much of Europe, the default political option in the interwar period. In

---

[4] See, for instance, Jean-Dominique Durand, *L'Europe de la Démocratie chrétienne* (Paris, 1995); Wolfram Kaiser, *Christian Democracy and the Origins of European Union (New York, 2007).*

[5] For a summation, see Charles S. Maier, "The Two Postwar Eras and the Conditions for Stability in Twentieth-Century Western Europe," *The American Historical Review* 86, 2 (April 1981), 327-52.

Spain, Portugal, Austria, Belgium, Hungary, Croatia, Slovakia, and France (Vichy), authoritarian Catholic leaders came to power with the enthusiastic support of the Vatican.

How are we to explain this transition between an authoritarian and a democratic Catholicism? Of those historians who have waded into these waters, most of them posit a rupture between the authoritarian Catholicism of the 1930s and the Christian Democracy of the 1940s. The only green shoots of Christian Democracy they find in the interwar period are those Catholics, vanishingly small in number, who actively supported parliamentary government in the 1930s and before. World War II, according to this hypothesis, took the familiar, reactionary options off the table, which allowed the previously-marginalized Christian Democrats to rush into power, leaving disappointed reactionaries with nowhere else to turn.

This is largely unconvincing, given the deep continuities that clearly existed between the interwar and postwar periods. As many scholars have shown, there were broad continuities in social policy, bureaucracy, and economic structure between the 1930s and 1940s: it beggars belief that political culture would undergo a dramatic transformation across the same period. Before continuing, I should make it clear that this is not a story of iron continuity: there *was* significant change in political culture, just as there was in social policy. I am merely suggesting that, just as historians are trained now to find connections between Vichy and the Fourth Republic at the level of policy, we look also for connections at the level of political culture.

Pope Leo XIII, in many ways the founder of modern Catholicism, points us towards a solution. He was the pope of *Ralliement*, a policy goading French Catholics to acclimate themselves to the Republic. He was also, however, the pope of *Rerum Novarum* (1891), an encyclical that laid out the social teachings of the Church. Leo made clear, that is, that while the Catholic Church is officially agnostic when it comes to questions of political form, there is official dogma when it comes to *social* form. Once we realize this, we can reformulate the standard research question. How,

previous historians have wondered, did Catholics become acclimated to *democracy* as a political form? They have been guided by an interpretation of European History as a sort of medieval morality play, in which the character called "Democracy" fends off a number of contenders before emerging victorious, due to a number of inherent virtues. If we are interested above all in democracy's passion play, then we have no choice but to posit a rupture between interwar and postwar Catholicism—or, more broadly, between interwar and postwar European political culture. But, as Leo XIII makes clear, Catholics were doctrinally obligated to remain indifferent to political form. Catholics simply did not understand the social order in terms of "politics", or "democracy." This explains the near-total lack of "Catholic political theory" in the years since 1890: there simply is no such thing. Leo XIII, to reiterate, had made it clear that Catholics *have* no political theory, while emphasizing simultaneously that they *did* have a social theory: that is, a sociology. This was quite a common refrain, in fact. "Catholicism is powerful because it is, above all, a sociology," declared Ferdinand Brunetière, editor of the *Revue des deux mondes*, in 1905.[6] Ernst Karl Winter, an Austrian Catholic who would go on to serve as vice-mayor of Vienna under Dollfuss's authoritarian regime, argued similarly. "In order to solve the problem of sovereignty in a Catholic sense," he writes, "the theme must be understood as sociological, and not legal."[7]

This might seem like a political disadvantage, but, as Carl Schmitt points out in his *Roman Catholicism and Political Form*, this political agnosticism is in fact the very source of Catholicism's enormous power. To understand how, we must remain alive to the specific form that modern power takes. As Timothy Mitchell and James C. Scott and Mark Bevir have shown from the perspective of political science, and as Philip Nord and Adam Tooze have shown from the perspective of history,

---

[6] Quoted Albéric Belliot, *Manuel de sociologie catholique* (Paris, 1911), 590.

[7] Ernst Karl Winter, "Souveränität," in *Die Österreichische Aktion* (Wien, 1927), 143-62, here 156.

and as Giorgio Agamben has shown from the perspective of philosophy, we need to look far beyond the vagaries of political leadership if we are to understand the exercise of modern power.[8] Nord refers to the post-1945 states as "technocorporatist" states, and describes the French Fourth Republic in terms that strongly recall Mitchell's portrayal of Egypt at the same time: these are states that are governed by a particular conjunction of social-scientific knowledge and bureaucratic planning.[9] The slippery concept of "democracy," in other words, is not an especially helpful rubric if we want to understand how European states rebuilt themselves after 1945.

In a phrase: Catholicism is a sociology—modern power requires, above all, a sociology. This should not sound especially radical. I am merely interested in placing Catholicism on the same playing field as its competitors. Liberalism and socialism, Catholicism's two great opponents, were not political theories in any simple sense. They were both engaged in complex rethinking of modern economic and social order. As Howard Brick has detailed in *Transcending Capitalism*, American theorists at this time were united in the idea that "capitalism" as theory and practice was outdated and needed to give way to more organized and socially-beneficial forms of economic organization. Catholics were doing the same thing, and learning at the feet of the same masters. As we will see,

---

[8] Daniel Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings* (Cambridge, MA, 1998); Philip Nord, *France's New Deal* (Princeton, 2010); J. Adam Tooze. *Statistics and the German State, 1900–1945* (New York, 2001); Mark Bevir, *Democratic Governance* (Princeton, 2010); Timothy Mitchell, *Rule of Experts* (Berkeley, 2002); Giorgio Agamben, *The Kingdom and the Glory*, trans. Lorenzo Chiesa (Stanford, 2011). For a critical perspective on this era's discovery of society, see Bruno Latour, "Gabriel Tarde and the End of the Social," in *The Social in Question*, ed. Patrick Joyce (London, 2002), 117-50. These figures are all operating, it is probably clear, from a broadly Foucauldian perspective (as Foucault makes clear, it does not matter who sits in the center of the Panopticon, or how they got there).

[9] This might explain the collapse of political-theory proper between the 1940s and 1960s, famously decried by Peter Laslett in 1956. Characteristic figures from across the Cold War West—Isaiah Berlin, Michael Oakeshott, Ernst-Wolfgang Böckenförde, Raymond Aron, Ronald Dahl—are more properly anti-political thinkers, committed as they were to forms of "pluralism" that would deprive the field of the political of as much autonomy as possible. For traditions of pluralism in American political thought and its critique by the New Left, see, among others, Darryl Baskin, "American Pluralism: Theory, Practice, and Ideology," *Journal of Politics* 32 (1970), 71-95; Nils Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future* (Baltimore, 2003); Ira Katznelson, *Desolation and Enlightenment* (New York, 2003); Edward Purcell, *The Crisis of Democratic Theory* (Lexington, 1973).

Catholics took the same sociological, post-capitalist turn as social theorists in non-Catholic traditions.[10]

Once we think of Catholicism as a means of comprehending and managing social reality – in other words, as a social science in an age of competing social sciences – its contribution to political culture between 1920 and 1950 snaps into focus. Catholics did not support the post-1945 states because they had become enamored with "democracy" in the abstract. Instead, they legitimated certain forms of democracy, which incarnated a social order that was, in many ways, representative of Catholic social thought as it had developed for decades. While there were all sorts of changes in Catholic political-social thought in the interwar period, which will be traced in the chapters to come, the fundamental argument here is that Catholics supported the post-1945 order not because they were weary or because their favored fascist solutions were off the table, but because the new order is what they had wanted all along. The postwar moment, therefore, had just as many continuities in politics and culture as it did in society and economics. In this sense, and at least until the firestorm of the 1960s, Western Europe remained God's continent.

Bishop von Ketteler and the Catholic Turn to Sociology

In the late nineteenth century, European intellectuals turned to the problem of "society." Alongside older accounts of the birth of "sociology" in the work of H. Stuart Hughes and others, a cluster of more historical studies by the likes of Stefan Collini, James Kloppenberg, and Daniel Rodgers have shown how this new framework was ratified in actual political practice: the birth of sociology, that is to say, was conditioned by the advent of new, activist states that were interested in administering this newly-discovered entity through a variety of means.[11] This literature has focused

[10] Howard Brick, *Transcending Capitalism* (Ithaca, 2006).

[11] H. Stuart Hughes, *Consciouness and Society* (New York, 1958); Stefan Collini, *Liberalism and Sociology* (Cambridge, 1979); James Kloppenberg, *Uncertain Victory* (New York, 1986); Daniel Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings* (Cambridge, MA, 1998).

on socialists, new Liberals, and liberal Protestants—and for good reason, as these were the standard-bearers of the new sociological imagination and politics. Catholics, however, took the sociological turn, too, and in ways that would bear historical fruit after 1945. They have, however, been almost entirely ignored, giving a historical *imprimatur* to the Catholic belief, here voiced by Romano Guardini, that "das Katholische is kein Typus neben anderen."[12]

This is a surprising omission, insofar as the welfare state that is the presumed *telos* of these studies, at least in Europe, truly came into being under Catholic auspices. Once the dust had settled, and Western Europe embarked on its *Wirtschaftswunder*, the Catholic tradition reigned supreme, as Christian Democratic parties came to power across the continent. Old-style nationalism had been discredited (or outlawed), while the gentlemanly liberalism of the French Radicals or German DDP had followed the vanguard English Liberals into irrelevance. Even the socialists were forced to take a backseat; where they had a hand in governing at all, as in Austria or the Netherlands, it was in coalition with the Christian Democrats. And while the socialists were forced to back away from Marx and the language of class warfare in the 1950s, Catholics never gave up on their own gurus of social theory.

Catholic sociology decidedly was not a rearguard action, undertaken unwillingly and with noses held so as to keep the godless working classes from slipping into socialism. Catholics put together a dynamic and complex social theory, and Catholic institutions gathered immense quantities of data to buttress it. In many cases, they learned a great deal from their competitors. To take just one example: Dan Rodgers has demonstrated that the *Kathedersozialisten*, notably Adolph Wagner and Gustav Schmoller, played a major role in turning Euro-American social theorists away from liberalism and towards sociology. Amidst the American progressives and European socialists filling their lecture halls, at least one Jesuit could be found. This was Heinrich Pesch, who emerged from

[12] Guardini, "Vom Wesen katholischer Weltanschauung", *Die Schildgenossen* 4, 2 (1923), 66-79, here 77.

his study with Wagner and Schmoller to become the most influential Catholic sociologist in Wilhelmine Germany (this will be discussed more fully in Chapter 3).[13]

And while Pesch differed in some ways from his teacher, he shared with them a desire to exorcize the specter of "atomization," widely held to be haunting Europe in the late nineteenth century. It is an open, because unanswerable, question whether or not such a phenomena is produced by modern capitalist societies (the question presumes, anyway, a peculiarly atavistic, Democritean notion of the "atom"). They do, however, produces *discourses* of atomization as surely as they produce any other commodity. The old bugbear of *Manchestertum*, if it had ever lived at all, was more or less dead by the 1880s: very few believed, any more, that the free market could be left to its own devices, and very many believed that modernity was headed directly, as Tocqueville had taught, towards frightening forms of "individualism." English conservatives turned to Randolph Churchill, and the Liberals to T.H. Green. In France, Frédéric Le Play, the Catholic sociologist, joined hands at least thus far with the sociological imagination of the Third Republic, represented most prominently by Emile Durkheim. In Germany, where laissez-faire policies had never made much headway, the *Kathedersozialisten* oversaw a sociological turn in German policy and thought, just as Bishop von Ketteler laid out the most brilliant and influential Catholic sociology of the nineteenth century. Meanwhile, in Austria the liberalism of *Ringstrasse Vienna* gave way to Austro-Marxism and Karl Lueger's Christian Socials.

Why, if Catholics took the turn to sociology in the late nineteenth century, and criticized "individualism" and unrestrained capitalism as much as anyone else, were they such destabilizing and critical denizens of the political landscape? In France and Germany, Catholics were among the strongest opponents of the emerging political and social order, while in Austria, Lueger ensured that Catholics fulminated against socialism and modernity as strongly as their coreligionists to the West.

---

[13] Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings*, 90-111.

There are a few easy answers to this question: Catholics were opposed to modernity in some sense, or they longed for a vanished and bucolic order, or they were xenophobic, or in thrall to a reactionary Vatican. These answers are comforting in their simplicity, and fully in line with the reigning interpretation of the Catholic trajectory, but, as the chapters to come will argue, they fly in the face of the evidence.

For a better reading of what made Catholics different—what made them out of step with their times—we can turn to Bishop von Ketteler (1811-77). It is he, and not Pius X and certainly not Christ, who stands at the origin of our story, and I'll discuss him here as an introduction to Catholic social theory in the interwar period. His work represents the first genuine confrontation between Catholicism and the new social-economic world of the nineteenth century, and his response shaped all of those that came after. As a bishop in the Rhineland, he was well-positioned to lead the way. There were not many places where a longstanding university culture coincided, geographically, with rapid industrialization in the 1840s: the university towns of Berlin, Paris, and Oxbridge were preindustrial, both economically and theoretically. The Rhineland, though, was different. Ancient universities here coincided with breakneck industrialization in one of the only regions to fully develop so early in the century. Two major figures observed the social and economic changes of the 1840s Rhineland, and were appalled at the injustices that they saw and the "atomism" it created. They created two sets of theories that would battle one another for the next century. One of these two was Kettler. The other was his almost-exact contemporary, who wrote his dissertation on Epicurean theories of the atom and its ties to abstract individualism: Karl Marx.

Like Marx, Ketteler was fantastically influential, despite the fact that his legacy was, again like Marx's, carried in numerous, sometimes contradictory, directions. For reasons to be explained below, my discussion will begin with the three major milieux that structured Catholic political life in the 1920s: France, the Rhineland, and Central Europe (i.e. Bavaria and Austria). The Catholic

political culture of each milieu, although taking his legacy in quite different directions, can be traced biographically back to Ketteler. French social Catholicism is rooted in a chance encounter between French aristocrats, in German prison during the Franco-Prussian war, and Ketteler's works. German Catholicism, too, is unthinkable without Ketteler: his disciples were the founders and theorists of the German Zentrum. Franz von Hitze, another disciple, served in the Reichstag and founded the *Volksverein für das katholische Deutschland*, the central organization for Catholic thought and action in Wilhelmine and Weimar Germany. Karl von Vogelsang, a student of Ketteler's, brought his insights to Vienna, where he became the grand doyen of Austrian Catholic thought.

Ketteler did much more than simply condemn all modern developments, crying like Lear for a return to a vanished order. Although he spent his life combating the errors of socialism, he shared all of the moral outrage, and much of the social-scientific analysis, of his enemies (indeed, a bizarre rumor circulated according to which Ketteler had actually baptized Lasalle![14]). "O yes," he declared in 1848, "I believe in the truth of all those sublime ideas that are stirring the world to its depths today."[15] As a member of the Frankfurt Parliament of that fateful year, Ketteler cast his lot with the liberals (keeping in mind, as James Sheehan has shown, that "liberalism" was quite a fractious and confused phenomenon at the time[16]). He was a close, and not altogether unsympathetic, reader of both Marx and Lasalle, while he applauded some of the étatiste social reforms initiated by Bismarck, such as the state takeover of the railways. He wanted a more just social order, in which industry would play a major role and in which workers could augment their wages through cooperative ownership of the means of production. He defended the right of labor to organize, and lauded the curtailment of the workday. More broadly, he wanted to overturn the abstract individualism thought

---

[14] Georg von Hertling, *Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben*, bd. 1 (München, 1919), 253.

[15] Joseph Husslein, "William Emmanuel von Ketteler," in *The Church and Labor* (New York, 1920), ed. John Ryan and Husslein, 24-54, here 26.

[16] James J. Sheehan, *German Liberalism in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago, 1978).

to be embedded in modern economic formations, while simultaneously protecting the increased production and technological innovation they produced.

Ketteler believed, however, that "those sublime ideas" cherished by liberals and socialists could not be realized through liberal or socialist methods, and he stridently opposed both Marx and Bismarck, both of whom explicitly disavowed him (Marx in a letter, Bismarck in the Reichstag). The competing solutions for social order, deprived of Christian teaching, would lead to tyranny. Even socialism, he predicted, would yield the "slavery of the Labor state." Likewise, he thundered throughout Bismarck's reign that the state was encroaching on territory that was not its own: the Church, most notably, but also the economy. The end result of all of these developments was "unbridled competition amongst the people dissolved into isolated individuals under the sole Control of an absolute monarch or an equally absolute National Assembly."[17]

The antidote, and the only one, was a "return to corporative forms," by which he meant subsidiary institutions, legitimated by natural law, that would mediate between the individual and the state. This is Ketteler's grand and simple idea, which would be passed down to generations of Catholics after him. His system, like those to come, was based throughout on the divinely-instituted right to private property, threatened with "unjustifiable encroachment" by socialist reform. Private property was defended as both the most charitable and the most *efficient* way to husband God's resources. While Ketteler did not doubt that these rights were being abused, these abuses were the direct result of atheism and the corollary replacement of charity, defined as the Christian form of taxation, with the taxes that modern States were levying by force. Economic transformation could never come from above, by fiat, but from below, leavened by moral regeneration and the principle of charity, mediated by natural social forms.

---

[17] Husslein, "William Emmanuel von Ketteler," 35, 41-2.

Ketteler was not so naïve as to think that private charity, as traditionally understood, could alone reform the social order. A legal framework was surely necessary to protect the rights of the worker and set the parameters for a socially just economy, without itself dominating that economy: the state, for Ketteler, was not simply to *vanish*, as in Marx, but to *structure* the economy and protect its natural, corporate order without dominating it. Practically, this would take the form of cooperative production, as virtuous employers, without delegating their property rights to a crusading and atheist state, would sell off much of the enterprise to the workers themselves, who would then, at least partially, own their own workplaces and share in the fruits of their own labor. The economy would be organized by cooperative guilds, as in medieval Christendom, instead of by competing classes.[18]

Although Ketteler was a modern figure in many ways, he also drew upon much older traditions of Catholic metaphysics. Catholicism is a religion of mediation: this is the key to all of these new political ideals, tying them both backwards to Catholic theology and forwards to contemporary political thought. The Catholic does not stand, like Job, shivering before a thundering God. Instead, he is enmeshed in a web of authority figures—parents, priests, bishops—each of which partake of Paul's dictum that all true authority is rooted in God. In earth as it is in heaven: the space separating man and God, however large it might be, is not empty. It is full of life: demons on the one hand, but also the panoply of saints and, above all, the Virgin Mother herself. "God the Father," as one recent memoirist has it, "was rarely addressed directly. There were intermediaries to carry one's petition to him."[19]

Although often seen as a forerunner of "Christian Democracy," Ketteler was uninterested in questions of political form (personally, he advocated a Greater Germany centered in Catholic

---

[18] Ibid., 42, 37, 38-9.

[19] Richard Rodriguez, *Hunger of Memory* (Boston, 1983), 90.

Austria, although this was far from the centerpiece of his work). He was for more interested in a management of modern economic forces and capital through putatively ancient Christian principles of social harmony and charity. The state would have a role to play, but a circumscribed one within a larger hierarchy of workers' cooperatives, families, and Churches. The right to private property would be paramount, and the state would not take over or manage industries, for reasons of both morality and efficiency. Worker's rights were to be protected, while avoiding the rhetoric of class conflict, admitting the impossibility of perfect income equality, and protecting the productive capacities of the nation as a whole.

It is hard to avoid the conclusion that Ketteler would have looked with pleasure on the economic reconstruction of Europe after 1945, regardless of the Christian nature of the parties involved. Postwar states trumpeted decentralization, social justice, and productivity, while avoiding large-scale nationalizations or class conflict. Under the guise of "anti-totalitarianism," which was, as we'll see, a Catholic invention, Ketteler's fear of sovereignty was universalized across the political spectrum, as socialists and liberals united behind the formerly Catholic criticism of the nation-state project. Political actors of all stripes were in favor of a wide-ranging "federalism," that would parcel the monopolized sovereignty of the state to sub-national institutions, like families and villages and churches, and super-national institutions, like the ECSC and the U.N. The purpose of the dissertation is to show that this is no accident—that Ketteler's successors played a major role in constructing and imagining the post-1945 settlement in Western Europe and Austria.

The Twin Aims of the Dissertation

This is certainly a tall order, so in this section I would like to clarify the precise goals of the work. While a great deal of primary-source and archival research has gone into this dissertation, the aim was not to deepen the understanding of a particular figure, movement or party, laudable as such work would be, and important as previous work of that sort has been to my own. I was interested,

primarily, in making two interventions, pursuant to my broader goal of writing a history of Catholicism that would not be about Catholicism, but about Europe. In this section, these goals will be clarified through a brief review of the extant literature.

First, I have investigated Catholicism as a *transnational political culture*. Previous historians have, of course, recognized the importance of Catholic political and social teaching. The big picture, though, has been missed by focusing overmuch on the same nation-state context that Catholics worked so hard, and so successfully, to undermine. Catholicism is tailor-made, it would seem, as a subject for the recent turn towards transnational history, and yet it has seldom been studied in that way. The best recent works on European Catholicism have all taken the nation-state as their privileged object of inquiry. The standard sources on modern Catholicism are a series of edited collections, in which each nation is granted an essay or a series of essays.[20]

When it comes to post-1914 Catholicism, only three figures have been attempting to think seriously about Catholicism as a transnational phenomenon: Martin Conway, Wolfram Kaiser, and Elke Seefried. While Conway and Kaiser have worked together, editing one of the volumes referred to above, their approaches differ. They both reject, quite rightly, the notion that masses of Catholic voters suddenly discovered the merits of democracy in 1945, and attempt to explain the triumph of Christian Democracy in light of broad continuities in Catholic culture and the Catholic milieu. In Kaiser's case, the success of Christian Democracy can be chalked up to two factors. First, the

---

[20] We do not lack for *comparative* approaches: a series of excellent volumes has appeared in which each national tradition is granted a separate article, following the precedent set in the still-useful *Church and Society*, ed. Joseph Moody (New York, 1953). *Political Catholicism in Europe, 1919-1945*, ed. Wolfram Kaiser and Helmut Wohnout (London, 2004); *Political Catholicism in Europe, 1918-1965*, ed. Tom Buchanan and Martin Conway (Oxford, 1996); *Religion und Nation, Nation und Religion,* ed. Michael Geyer and Hartmut Lehmann (Göttingen, 2005); *Die Rolle des politischen Katholizismus in Europa im 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Heiner Timmermann (Berlin, 2009). This comparative approach also survives into Ellen L. Evans's useful *The Cross and the Ballot* (Boston, 1999), in which each national tradition is neatly marked off from the others. Some volumes that claim to be international in scope, notably Karl-Egon Lönne's *Politischer Katholizismus im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt, 1986) and Jay Corrin's *Catholic Intellectuals and the Challenge of Democracy* (South Bend, 2002), end up focusing almost exclusively on one national milieu (Germany in the first case; Britain, strangely enough, in the second). This is less problematic for the nineteenth century: John Boyer's essay in Kaiser-Wohnout collection provides an excellent international overview of nineteenth-century Catholicism, as does Paul Misner's *Social Catholicism in Europe* (New York, 1991).

changed circumstances of the post-1945 period and the delegitimization of the traditional Catholic right. Second, the ready availability of a network of political elites and intellectuals who had been theorizing and supporting Christian democracy in the interwar period. Conway basically agrees with this story, but he grants interwar preparation even less significance than does Kaiser: "Christian Democracy," he chides in a statement that invalidates much other work on the topic, "did not suddenly become the most successful political force in western Europe because various largely minority currents of European Catholics had long been seeking to construct a pluralist form of Catholic politics which engaged with modern society."[21]

What both of them ignore is Catholic political culture: one searches in vain throughout their work for any real description of what Catholics were actually saying about politics in periodicals or monographs. Kaiser focuses on elite, minority currents, while Conway polemically states that ideology mattered less than taxation policies and sugar beet prices. One move they both make is worth discussing, as their example will be followed here: neither of them grant much significance to the Vatican. Of course, the Church's encyclicals had influence across Europe, and indeed the globe, but that will not be my focus here. The telegenic pope, personally guiding his flock, is a product of the Cold War. This does not mean, of course, that the Vatican hierarchy should be ignored, but it does mean that it cannot be equated in any simple way with Catholic politics across Europe.[22]

I will not follow them, however, in their studied disinterest in Catholic political culture as it existed on the ground: here, Elke Seefried, the third historian of transnational interwar Catholicism, has done a remarkable, if circumscribed, service by charting the role of German emigrés in

---

[21] Wolfram Kaiser, *Christian Democracy and the Origins of European Union* (New York, 2007); Martin Conway, *Catholic Politics in Europe, 1918-1945* (London, 1997); Martin Conway, "The Rise and Fall of Western Europe's Democratic Age, 1945-73," *Contemporary European History* 13 (2004), 67-88, here 81.

[22] It is often forgotten, too, that the Pope was not merely responding to domestic Italian crises, but took inspiration and models from elsewhere, particularly Germany. See, for instance, Sándor Agócs, "'Germania Doceat!' The Volksverein, the Model for Italian Catholic Action, 1905-1914," *Catholic Historical Review* 61 (1975), 31-47.

theorizing the Austrian *Ständestaat*.[23] By referring to "political culture," I mean to register that I, like Seefried, will not be focusing on elite discourse, or the history of theology. The main players in the dissertation, with the possible exception of Jacques Maritain and the indubitable exception of Carl Schmitt, were not brilliant or original thinkers in their own right. They mattered, and will be discussed here, because they structured what Catholicism *qua* political-social discourse: what was it possible to say within the confines of a Catholic political movement or Catholic journal? Brilliant and idiosyncratic figures like Teilhard de Chardin will be ignored, as they did not influence political culture in any serious way, while uninteresting thinkers like Jean de Fabrègues will be discussed in detail, insofar as they were able to exercise intellectual power through the periodical (of which Fabrègues edited many). Intellectual power and influence was mediated across these years primarily by the periodical. In Régis Debray's account of "intellectual power," the 1920-60 period is theorized as a period in which editors, more than professors (or priests), held sway.[24] The efflorescence of lay Catholic periodicals (or Dominican ones that functioned as such) will provide the dissertation's major source base, supplemented by pamphlets, monographs, and archival material.

The transnational approach truly pays dividends here, and the dissertation will not follow the traditional country-by-country approach to Catholic history. At least, not for the majority of the dissertation. It is true that in the 1910s and early 1920s, still stung by the retrenchment of the war, there was little in the way of international Catholic life: as we'll see in Chapters 1-3, most Catholics hunkered into their respective milieux. But, beginning in the late 1920s, a truly transnational Catholicism did begin to emerge, as will be traced in Chapters 4-5. There were two causes: first, the general internationalist spirit that swept across Europe in the era of Locarno; second, the waves of

---

[23] Elke Seefried, *Reich und Stände* (Düsseldorf, 2006).

[24] Régis Debray, *Le pouvoir intellectuel en France* (Paris, 1979). Debray was speaking only of France, but this can be extended elsewhere.

refugees that accompanied that era's collapse. The Germany of 1933, the Austria of 1938, and the France of 1940 threatened the freedom, and sometimes the lives, of at least certain brands of Catholic intellectuals. They fled everywhere they could, including such far-flung destinations as Rio de Janeiro (Dietrich von Hildebrand) or Istanbul (Friedrich Dessauer). As they fled, sometimes multiple times, they encountered and enlivened new political cultures, and genuine international influence and cooperation began to occur. This would bear fruit primarily after 1945, when the international Catholicism we know today, studded by international conferences and journals, was consolidated. But that post-1945 Catholicism, which I'll call Cold War Catholicism, cannot be understood without understanding its transnational preconditions.

While there is no doubt that the story is transnational, my decision to tell a *particular* transnational story must be defended. Despite the pretensions of the dissertation's subtitle, I cannot pretend to tell the story of European Catholicism as a whole. I will focus primarily on France, Germany, and Austria. These three nations provide a relatively coherent narrative: as we'll see, patterns of exile and linguistic competence brought these three nations together, time and again. French Catholics were interested in Austrian affairs far more than in Dutch ones, and vice versa. In each case, Catholics played an uncertain and fractious role in national politics, leading to voluminous lay speculation about the shape and prospects of Catholic politics—speculation that lay the groundwork for Cold War Catholicism. Similar phenomena could be traced in Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and even Britain, but at the cost of narrative economy and even coherence, as each of those regions had unique trajectories, conditioned in most cases by more direct clerical influence than was the case in my chosen areas.[25]

[25] Belgium would be the most obvious example to include, but as Martin Conway has shown in his "Building the Christian City: Catholics and Politics in Interwar Francophone Belgium," *Past and Present* 128 (1990), 117-51, the story was intellectually Francophone and tied directly to events and ideologies in France.

Eastern European Catholicism, in particular, is left out of the story, aside from the surprisingly strong Silesian voice in German Catholicism and the occasional presence of Bohemian refugees in Austria. This story is a fascinating one, but it is quite simply a different one than the one I'm telling here: Eastern Europeans developed their own Catholicism, with stronger ties to nationalism than was the case in Western Europe or Austria. Moreover, the dissertation is unabashedly focused on the post-1945 settlement, which Eastern Europeans, for obvious reasons, inhabited in quite a different way.[26]

That, then, is my first intervention: the study of Catholicism as a transnational political culture. My second intervention flows organically from the first: Catholic historiography has been split into those who study "Catholicism and the state" (political parties, intellectuals, etc.) and those who study "Catholicism and society" (Catholic civil-society institutions, the press, unions, youth movements, popular piety, pilgrimage movements, etc.). I am not intervening directly into either of these literatures. Readers looking for new insights about the *Zentrum*'s response to Hitler, or the ideology of the youth movements, will be disappointed. I am, instead, trying to unite these two literatures in pursuit of a more complete picture of Catholicism, which was not a denizen of "State" or "Society," but rather a set of institutions that straddled the two. Catholicism did not sit comfortably within a settled "State/society" division, but rather came to the table with a particular vision of how that division should be made.

This sounds hopelessly abstract and theoretical, I'm aware. Terms like "state" and "society" often indicate a lack of analytical precision. This, though, is precisely the point. As political theorists like Timothy Mitchell and Jacques Rancière have argued, the fulcrum of democratic politics is the

---

[26] For the best accounts of East European Catholicism, see James Bjork, *Neither German Nor Pole* (Ann Arbor, 2008); Paul Hanebrink, *In Defense of Christian Hungary* (Ithaca, 2006); Till van Rahden, *Jews and Other Germans* (Madison, WI, 2000). Piotr Kassicki's forthcoming dissertation, which demonstrates the ties between French and Polish Catholicism, breaks new ground in an attempt to tell the stories of East and West together.

decision regarding which sectors should be "political" (governed democratically, through the state) and which should be "social" (removed from direct democratic oversight). Here's Mitchell:

> The line between state and society is not the perimeter of an intrinsic entity, which can be thought of as a freestanding object or actor. It is a line drawn internally, *within* the network of institional mechanisms through which a certain social and political order is maintained.[27]

The line between state and society is always a blurry one, as even the most laissez-faire state exercises major influence on the putatively free economy operating under its purview. But it is a line that needs always to be drawn, and a line whose location is always contested. To what extent are phenomena like the family, the firm, the union, and so on to be folded into the "State," and to what extent are they to operate oustide of democratic channels?

More than socialists or even (until the 1940s) liberals, Catholics were interested in enlarging "society" as much as possible: i.e., they wanted the state to shrink dramatically in size, allowing the "natural" order of "society" to govern economic life as much as possible. The democracies of the 1920s, as we will see, crusaded in favor of an activist state that would democratically control wide swathes of society (education, economy, etc.). Catholics saw this as inexcusable trespass on the grounds of the "social" and its natural ordering, and their social thought was "social" in the deepest sense: the state, they believed, should retreat from society and allow the latter to develop in its own, natural way. The state should not wither away—Catholics were not liberals, nor were they Marxists—but should itself assume a limited, natural, but nonetheless robust place in the political-social order.

To summarize: I make, here, two major interventions. 1) I tell a story that is deeply transnational. 2) I understand Catholicism as a response to a fundamental question of modern social life: where should the state/society line be drawn? Neither of these approaches have been explored

---

[27] Timothy Mitchell, "The Limits of the State," *American Political Science Review* 85 (1991), 77-96, here 90.

in the extant historiography, which I will survey here. First of all, of course, there is the mountain of research from what Oded Heilbronner calls "the ghetto of the Catholic establishment." Produced by Catholic scholars and published by Catholic presses, this work, sometimes excellent and useful, avoids critical perspectives and fails to engage with broader debates (this is only the flipside of the disinterest in Catholicism, itself a result of long-term institutional trends, evinced in the non-Catholic historical profession). In Germany, this work is often linked with the Institut für Zeitgeschichte in Bonn, or published by Ferdinand Schoningh; in France, leading scholars of Catholicism like Philippe Chenaux, Jacques Prévotat, and René Rémond are linked with the similar Centre catholique des intellectuels français.[28]

In the last few decades, a plethora of scholars have begun researching Catholicism from a more, shall we say, catholic perspective. Early works, like those by Eugen Weber, assumed that Catholicism had declined in significance as modern states consolidated themselves in the late nineteenth century. But now, after a generation of work by scholars like Margaret Anderson, Marjorie Beale, Edward Berenson, David Blackbourn, Werner Blessing, Caroline Ford, Antonius Liedhegener, Philip Nord, Susan Pedersen, and Jonathan Sperber, this argument is no longer tenable.[29] It is now beyond question that the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were marked by Catholic revival, in terms of associational culture, political activisim, and public piety.

---

[28] Oded Heilbronner, "From Ghetto to Ghetto: The Place of German Catholic Society in Recent Historiography," *Journal of Modern History* 72 (2000), 453-95, here page 456; Claire Toupin Guyot, *Les intellectuels catholiques dans la société française* (Rennes, 2002)

[29] In lieu of citing all of this work, I refer the reader to the literature reviews noted below for the German case; for the French case, the debate between Eugen Weber, *Peasants into Frenchmen* (Stanford, 1976) and Caroline Ford, *Creating the Nation in Provincial France* (Princeton, 1993) is emblematic. The most influential and pathbreaking work in this literature is probably Jonathan Sperber, *Popular Catholicism in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Princeton, 1984), while Antonius Liedhegener, *Christentum und Urbanisierung* (Paderborn, 1997), is especially useful for a comparative account of Protestant and Catholic Germany (demonstrating the special religious vitality of the latter). Other scholars have added to this literature by showing how anti-Catholicism was constitutive of the liberal republicanism that arose to combat its influence. Geoffrey Cubitt, *The Jesuit Myth* (Oxford, 1993); Michael Gross, *The War Against Catholicism* (Ann Arbor, 2004).

Indeed, Catholicism as we know it was really a product of the late nineteenth-century flurry of activity, and not the long tail of an ancient and declining Church.

There has been, however, no satisfactory attempt to connect this with the post-1945 period, especially on a transnational scale. The extant literature presents two basic and convincing ways of relating post-1945 Catholicism to its predecessors. The first has been most prominent in French history, where the failure of Catholic political parties has turned historians' attention towards social movements and policies. Historians have focused a great deal on Catholic civil-society institutions and their influence on economic policy under various regimes, including Vichy. Marjorie Beale, Philip Nord, and Susan Pedersen have demonstrated beyond doubt that Catholic institutions and ideologies were central to French economic policies in the interwar and postwar period, in addition, obviously, to the Pétain regime.[30] While the M.R.P. may have been short-lived, the welfare policies percolating in the youth movements and workers' cooperatives of interwar Catholicism played a major role.

While these historians have focused on Catholicism as a social phenomenon, a number of historians of Germany, which had successful Catholic or Christian parties throughout the twentieth century, have focused more on Catholicism as a directly political phenomenon. The role of Catholics in the democratic system has been studied exhaustively in the work of, among others, Margaret Anderson, David Blackbourn, Werner Blessing, John Boyer, Noel Cary, Wilfried Loth, Jonathan Sperber, Helmut Walser Smith, and Rudolf Uertz. Following on the heels of Ronald Ross's *Beleagured Tower* (1976), these scholars have attempted to bring Catholicism, and particularly the Center Party, into the center of the raging debate on the *Kaiserreich* and, to a lesser extent, the Weimar and Bonn Republics. Unlike in France, the influence of Catholic thought on the social market economy has

---

[30] Nord, *France's New Deal*; Marjorie Beale, *The Modernist Enterprise* (Stanford, 1999), esp. chapter 4; Susan Pedersen, *Family, Dependence, and the Origins of the Welfare State* (Cambridge, 1993), esp. chapter 5.

been almost entirely ignored (despite the fact that it was enacted by a Catholic administration, with the support of Catholic economists!).[31]

From our perspective, the most important work comes from Margaret Anderson, Noel Cary, Karl-Egon Lönne, and Winfried Becker, who have been arguing in favor of what Cary calls a "Catholic *Sonderweg*." For these scholars, post-1945 West German political culture was foreshadowed above all in the Center party. The Catholic party in the Bismarckean, Wilhelmine, and Weimar regimes, even though it had been skeptical of democracy *qua* system of governance, nonetheless sought to protect civil liberties, and were the strongest voices in favor of fair parliamentary elections and balanced government. Unlike contemporary parties, and like the postwar CDU, the Zentrum brought together a broad spectrum of German society: Catholics from different classes and regions voted for the party, which was forced to accommodate their interests and become a sort of catch-all party. There were even a fair number of activists within the Zentrum who wanted to "leave the tower" and become an interconfessional party.

French historians, then, have constructed a Catholicism of "society," while German historians have construced a Catholicism of the "state." Both of these approaches are correct, and a dissertation of this scope cannot hope to add much detail to these specialized studies. The problem is that neither approach adds up to a balanced appraisal of the fate of Catholicism across the period 1920-1950. The German/Austrian approach to "Christian Democracy" as a political phenomenon has no obvious bearing on the French case, while the attention paid to French "Social Catholicism" seems irrelevant to the German case. Clearly, though, a single story can and should be told: French and German Catholics were, by the 1940s, tied together in myriad ways and were clearly involved in

[31] I cannot hope to provide more than an overview of the voluminous literature on the German Catholic milieu, which has ballooned to such proportions that at least three major attempts to survey it have been undertaken in recent years. See Margaret Anderson, "Piety and Politics: Recent Work on German Catholicism," *Journal of Modern History* 63 (1991), 681-716; Karl-Egon Lönne, "Katholizismus-Forschung," *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 6 (2000), 128-170; Oded Heilbronner, "From Ghetto to Ghetto: The Place of German Catholic Society in Recent Historiography."

the same political-social project: one defined neither by "State" or "Society," but by the peculiarly Catholic means of finding the division between the two. By tying their analyses directly to the nation-state, scholars have missed a broad, transnational shift in Catholic political culture, which unites the various phenomena traced in the French and German literatures. Briefly, what we find in each case is that Catholics, responding to a new international context, were willing to grant legitimacy to the new post-1945 nation states, precisely because their own social-political ideals were inscribed in the new regimes, whether or not a Catholic or Christian-Democratic party was actually at the helm.

And, to return finally to our beginning point: Catholics across Western Europe were willing to grant legitimacy to the new regimes because they drew the line between state and society in an acceptable place. For reasons that will be explored in the chapters to come, Catholics had become convinced that the great tragedy of modernity was that this line had been drawn improperly: that the *state* had been granted too much control over the modern social order. After World War II, liberals and socialists—the former *bêtes noires* of the Catholics—suddenly agreed with them. Totalitarianism theory, invented by Catholics as a modern restatement of Ketteler's position, was accepted across the political spectrum, and conditioned a broad agreement, now rejected by scholars, that Nazism and Communism were both fundamentally similar, and marked by a common hypertrophy of the state, which ran roughshod over "society."

The Structure of the Dissertation

The dissertation is organized into three parts. Part I, which covers the early 1920s, is composed of three short chapters, each devoted to one of the three major milieux that structured Catholic culture and politics across the region in question. These chapters introduce the reader to the various institutions, schools of thought, and political cultures at work in the wake of World War I. There were three major Catholic milieux at the time: France, Mitteleuropa, and the Rhineland. I

will use "Mitteleuropa" to refer to Southern Germany and Austria.[32] At this time, there was very little in the way of international circulation of ideas or texts outside of circumscribed and marginal phenomena.[33] These chapters introduce the reader to three individuals, one from each milieu, who will be followed throughout the dissertation, both as a narrative device and because these three figures were especially important. For France (Chapter 1), I will follow Jacques Maritain, who was then a leading Catholic intellectual in the orbit of the Action française. For Mitteleuropa (Chapter 2), I will follow Eugen Kogon, a Southern German who was living in Vienna and serving as co-editor of *Schönere Zukunft*, the region's pre-eminent Catholic political journal. For the Rhineland (Chapter 3), the focus will be on Waldemar Gurian, a polymath student of Max Scheler's and Carl Schmitt's who was involved in many of the region's most significant Catholic institutions, newspapers, and periodicals.

In Part II, which focuses on the mid-1930s, I will show how Catholicism became transnational – and, moreover, that Catholicism was one of the three major transnational constellations of the period, alongside Fascism and Popular-Front Communism. Catholicism is not usually seen in that light, which leads us to misinterpret both the 1930s and the 1940s: once we reconstruct Catholicism as a major political and intellectual player, the post-1945 period can be construed as the victory of one of the warring parties of the 1930s, and not the mutual exhaustion of all of them.

Like socialism, though, transnational Catholicism was divided into warring factions, each of which had its own intellectual figureheads and political counterparts. Chapter 4, which focuses on

---

[32] I am aware that "Mitteleuropa" is a controversial term with a great many meanings (see, for instance, Jürgen Elvert, *Mitteleuropa* (Stuttgart, 1999)). I am adopting it here as the least bad solution to the problem of referring to this region, and I certainly don't intend to legitimate the claims of the intellectuals themselves that there was any mystical unity in the lands of central Europe.

[33] For which see Jean-Claude Delbreil, *Les catholiques française et les tentatives de rapprochement franco-allemand (1920-1933)* (Metz, 1972); Kaiser, *Christian Democracy and the Origins of the European Union*, chapters 1-4.

the continuing career of Jacques Maritain and Waldemar Gurian, covers what I'm calling "civil-society Catholicism." By this point, Maritain and Gurian were friends and allies, linked to a massive set of Catholic movements that went by the name of "Catholic Action." For the first time, journals and manifestoes were truly international in character. Maritain was beginning to cultivate ties with Americans and Germans, while Gurian, from exile in Switzerland, published an anti-Nazi journal that was read across Europe. They were both arguing that Catholicism did not mandate a specific form of political *or social* organization at all—with the one major exception that Catholicism could not survive in "totalitarian" societies, which featured the only form of politics manifestly outlawed by Catholic teaching. These Catholics opposed authoritarian regimes like Mussolini's and Franco's precisely because their "politics" were totalitarian and denied the freedom within civil society that was necessary for Catholicism to flourish. These were, incidentally, the first Catholics to seriously imply, even if they did not say so, that Catholicism was compatible with industrial capitalism as it existed in America and Europe. Although their insights were essentially in line with Ketteler's, they were less interested in corporatist institutions and the failures of capitalism than with civil freedoms and the liberty of the Church. While these Catholics were probably in the minority in the 1930s, they were aligned with a powerful set of social movements, most notably Catholic Action and certain strands of the right-wing French *ligues*. As always with apolitical movements, however, a strong politics was certainly implied, and performed.

Also unlike Ketteler, these Catholics spent as much of their energy fighting against other Catholics as they did against secularists. Their enemies, discussed in Chapter 5, were the "corporatists," and one of their champions was Eugen Kogon. Kogon and the other corporatists argued, *contra* the civil-society Catholics, that Catholicism *did* enjoin a particular socio-political order. Drawing on *Quadragesimo Anno* and remaining more true to Ketteler's original insights, they argued that a corporatist and anti-capitalist economic order was necessary, even if it had to be achieved

through violence. Like their opponents, the corporatists were transnational: Kogon's work was read in France, for instance, while Dollfuss's experiments were applauded by right-wing French Catholics, some of whom went to Austria to study the new Catholic utopia in the making. These Catholics, too, were opposed to "totalitarianism," and saw their authoritarian corporatism as the only true defense against the totalitarian politics of Nazis and Bolsheviks.

The last three chapters will chart the overcoming of this divide in the crucible of World War II and its aftermath, as the Catholics' common opposition to totalitarianism, alongside new geopolitical circumstances, allowed them to present a united front in the early years of the Cold War (I am calling this "Cold War Catholicism"). This period did not see the "victory" of one of these brands of Catholicism, but rather their cooperation and merging in a new geopolitical context. Chapter 6 covers the years of the war itself, and shows the surprising rapprochement between *both forms* of Catholicism and neoliberalism during these years, prefiguring the ideological cleavages of the Cold War. Jacques Maritain and Waldemar Gurian, both in exile in America, played a major role here. In addition, this chapter demonstrates the collapse of authoritarian corporatism as a viable option, after the Anschluss and the widespread Catholic disaffection with Vichy beginning in 1942-3; Kogon, who was imprisoned in Dachau after the Anschluss, is paradigmatic here.

In Chapter 7, the immediate post-war period is discussed. The war had changed everything, of course, but Catholic ideas and transnational networks from the interwar period survived and were integral to the anti-Communist turn taken by Catholic states in 1946-7. Chapter 8 discusses the final consolidation of "Cold War Catholicism," as old barriers melted away and Catholics joined hands in support of the new European order. They did so not because the new regimes were "democratic," but because they were anti-totalitarian. These were regimes that deployed weak forms of state sovereignty, and were committed, at least in principle, to religious freedom and to strong forms of federalism.

All three of our central figures were involved in Cold War Catholicism. Jacques Maritain emerged from the war as Catholic Europe's most famous intellectual. He served as French ambassador to the Vatican, and was involved with both the United Nations and UNESCO. Gurian founded and edited a journal, *The Review of Politics*, which was one of the key incubators of Cold War liberalism. He became a consummate Cold Warrior, playing an important role in the American understanding of Germany and vice-versa (he traveled, thanks to the Rockefeller Foundation, to the "America Houses" to lecture on the virtues of America and the evils of totalitarianism in the late 40s). Kogon worked for the U.S. Army in Germany and published *Der SS-Staat*, which sold hundreds of thousands of copies and was one of the most important books on Nazism in late 1940s Germany; he was also editor of *Frankfurter Hefte*, one of a handful of postwar Germany's most significant journals.

These three figures, then, mirror the fate of European Catholicism as a whole. They began, like most Catholics in the 1920s, as strict interpreters of Ketteler's legacy. Modern politics and modern economics, they all believed, were a complete disaster, and needed to be overturned in the name of a properly Catholic social order. In the 1930s, like most European Catholics, their lives were turned upside-down by events. Gurian and Maritain were forced into American exile, while Kogon was placed in a concentration camp. Their interpretation of Catholicism and its place in modern society began to change, as did that of their liberal and socialist opponents. After the war, they emerged into a Europe that was, surprisingly, congenial to the political-social insights they had been circulating for decades. However much they may have fulminated against the liberal-democratic capitalism of the 1920s, it was in this way that they became, unwittingly and unknowingly, the saviors of that same order.

Part One: The Rhenish Question: Sovereignty and European Catholicism, 1920-1925

All those who have profoundly studied Europe know that the German problem lies, morally and geographically, at the center of all the problems and sufferings of that continent.
--Jacques Maritain, 1940[1]

The decision about Germany, over the question whether it should be unified and, if need be, neutralized, can fundamentally alter the collective politics of Western Europe.
--Eugen Kogon, 1951[2]

Will it be necessary in the interest of lasting peace to dismember Germany politically? Or, will it be possible to maintain German unity and accept—sooner or later—a re-educated and reformed Germany as an equal partner in a forthcoming international organization? […] [A]ny settlement with Germany is related to universal problems.
--Waldemar Gurian, 1945[3]

[1] Maritain, "Europe and the Federal Idea," *Commonweal* 26 April 1940, 8-12, here 10.

[2] Kogon to Paul-Henri Spaak, 1 March 1951, ME 613, Historical Archives of the European Union, European Institute, Florence.

[3] Gurian, "On the Future of Germany," *Review of Politics* 7, 1 (January 1945), 3-14, here 7, 12.

Introduction to Part One

Insofar as the father is the archetype of authority, because the original experience of all authority, democracy is, according to its idea, a fatherless society.
--Hans Kelsen[1]

World War I and its aftermath, while devastating for Europe as a whole, were stimulating for Catholicism, Europe's ancient faith. Like many of their peers, Catholics across the continent had positively welcomed the war as an opportunity to burst free from *fin de siècle* decadence. "To be honest," admitted one Austrian Catholic in 1926, "we all wanted the war in 1914."[2] Although Catholics on the ground and in the Vatican were, like everyone else, horrified at the destruction it eventually unleashed, the chaos and ruin left in the war's wake created opportunities. "The chaos is an anxious chaos," one British Jesuit wrote in 1920. "Men are beginning to ask, not so much what the war has achieved, as what it revealed."[3] For many, and not only for Catholics, it revealed the bankruptcy of the liberal pieties that had legitimated the prewar European settlement. As empires collapsed, leaving massive economic problems and political crises in their wake, Catholicism found its moment. "True anarchy," as Novalis had claimed long before, "is the breeding ground of religion."[4]

Catholics were faced with what Hubert Lyautey, a Catholic French general, called the "universal collapse of thrones and of all that they symbolize."[5] Even in places like Belgium, where the throne remained, Catholics found themselves forced to participate for the first time in

---

[1] Hans Kelsen, "Foundations of Democracy," *Ethics* 66, 1 (1955), 1-101, here 31.

[2] Ernst Karl Winter, "Das konservative und liberale Österreich: Würdigung und Kritik seiner Kultur," in *Die Österreichische Aktion* (Wien, 1927), 113-26, here 121.

[3] C.C. Martindale, "After-War Religion," *Dublin Review* 166, 333 (April 1920), 161-71, here 161.

[4] Quoted Paul-Ludwig Landsberg, *Die Welt des Mittelalter und Wir* (Bonn, 1923), 115.

[5] Quoted Gerard Cholvy and Yves-Marie Hilaire, *Histoire religieuse de la France contemporaine* (Tolouse, 1985-1988), Tome 2, 263.

parliamentary elections against Liberals and Socialists. Catholics across the continent responded creatively and forged one of the most penetrating, and eventually most successful, analyses of the new situation. "One is not born traditional," Bruno Latour reminds us. On the contrary, "one chooses to become traditional by constant innovation."[6] While there were, of course, millions who attended Church for reasons of family or regional tradition, Catholicism was a vibrant discourse that attracted some of the best minds of the era, and Catholic rhetoric was not defined by the bucolic parish priest. We are all familiar with the period's intellectuals who flocked to the Church, or at least to its aura, as a gesture of discontent: Graham Greene and Evelyn Waugh in Britain; Hugo Ball and Edith Stein in Germany; Jean Cocteau and Gabriel Marcel in France (to give only the most obvious names). This is not especially important in itself—as contemporary Catholics were wont to point out, these aesthetic conversions were often temporary and opportunistic. What they register, though, is a sense that Catholicism was out of step with the times, and that it provided a refuge from those times. Hugo Ball's reconstruction of his path to the Church was called, after all, *Flight Out of Time*.

In what sense, though, was Catholicism a refuge from the times? It was not writ in stone that Catholicism would emerge in this way: Catholicism did not serve as such a dissenting ideology *du jour* in, say, the 1840s, or the 1950s, or the 2010s. The fact that it did so in the 1920s requires explanations that move beyond clichéd notions of the post-WWI "return of the sacred" or "collapse of the Enlightenment project." While this may have mattered to an intellectual elite, it hardly underpinned Catholic political culture writ large. In fact, we might expect Catholicism to ratify the postwar moment: the war had finally demonstrated beyond doubt that French and German Catholics were loyal to their respective nations, while the reconstituted states were, in general, quite friendly to religion, constitutionally speaking. Diplomatic ties were renewed between France and the

[6] Bruno Latour, *We Have Never Been Modern,* trans. Catherine Porter (Cambridge, MA, 1993), 76.

Vatican, while the Weimar Constitution protected Church schools and property as well as could be expected.

Perhaps, we might think, a Europe was being born that was peculiarly repugnant to the Catholic imagination? This was, however, not the case, at least not in any simple way. To a surprising extent, and with the exception of educational policy, Catholics had little quarrel with the actual social and economic policies that were being enacted in the 1920s, and their outrage over *cultural* decadence was shared by almost all governing parties. Pius XI admitted as much in *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931), pointing out that post-WWI social legislation had a great deal in common with Catholic social teaching.[7] The bourgeois recasting of Europe, as famously described by Charles Maier, embodied many Catholic ideals.[8] This is quite schematic and will be developed in more local detail later, but generally we can say the following: negatively, both Catholics and the regimes of the 1920s were opposed to revolutionary socialism and Bolshevism, freezing them out in the name of private property. Positively, they were each dedicated to a corporatist restructuring of the State in which centralizing parliaments would, at least in terms of economic policy, give a greater voice to professions, employers' federations, and labor unions. Catholics and the reigning political powers were both dedicated to steering a path between collectivism and atomized individualism: the putative hegemony of *Manchestertum* was fictitious, as actors of nearly all political stripes argued for increased organization of the economy and increased socialization of the individual into his or her community. Not only Catholics, but socialists and liberals were convinced of the importance of the family and its protection.[9]

---

[7] Pius XII, *Quadragesimo Anno*, paragraphs 22 and 28.

[8] Charles Maier, *Recasting Bourgeois Europe* (Princeton, 1975).

[9] For a general account of the rise of the social sciences in this period, albeit one that misconstrues them as a peculiarly liberal project, see Dorothy Ross, "Changing Contours of the Social Science Disciplines," in *The Modern Social Sciences*, vol. 7 of the *Cambridge History of Science*, ed. Ross and Theodore Porter (New York, 2008), 205-37.

So the question remains: what was the Catholic objection to the Europe of the 1920s? An answer requires an investigation of "the political," in the broadest sense of that word. The Catholic conception of the political—of what the sphere of politics can and should mean, of where its legitimacy was to be found—was categorically opposed to that of their liberal and socialist colleagues. This is not so simple as saying that Catholics wanted a Catholic state, just as socialists wanted a socialist state. The banal observation that Catholic politics differed from socialist politics explains very little. More interesting and important is the divergent conception of the political itself—of the very nature of the state and the society it constructs. To take one especially trenchant example: Catholics were, to varying degrees, opposed to parliamentary democracy. This was not because they were opposed to "modernity" or to "secularity" or even to "democracy." Catholics were opposed to a very specific idea of democracy: that held by liberals and socialists at the time. Indeed, blanket opposition to democracy had been outlawed by Leo XIII, and, as we'll see below, even the most strident legitimists were clear that *certain* forms of democracy would be acceptable—just not the forms that were on offer in the 1920s.

The fundamental Catholic objection to the democracies of the 1920s was their abolition of what were variously called corporations, estates, or "natural political communities." Catholics charged, not without reason, that the new states used the authority of the "people" writ large to reconstruct the political-social order, without reference to the pre-statist communities of the profession, church, and family. Catholics, on the contrary, were committed to political theories of what we might call deep subsidiarity, in which the state would take its place among a hierarchy of legitimate and divinely-ordained corporations. It was not even to be the most important of these: the family, G.K. Chesterton wrote in 1910, "is older than law and stands outside the state." In the 20s, this sensibility placed them at odds with the other major denizens of the political scene. In the 30s

and 40s, as forthcoming chapters will detail, these same political ideals came to seem much less out of touch.

It is worth noting here that the Catholic position shared a great deal with, and freely learned from, the "pluralist" tradition of political thought, exemplified most famously in the work of Figgis, Cole, and Laski. Their "guild socialist" ideas were highly in vogue in the 1910s; even Bertrand Russell advocated a version of their ideas in his 1918 *Roads to Freedom*. On the continent, "legal pluralist" ideas found their champion in Léon Duguit. Like the Catholics, these figures sought to replace the abstractions of sovereign law: Figgis, for instance, wrote in 1907 of the need to replace "an abstract and unreal theory of State omnipotence" with a theory that incorporated "the facts of the world with its innumerable bonds of association and the naturalness of social authority." These words would be repeated, nearly verbatim, by hundreds of Catholics in the interwar years. The basically secular tradition of pluralism, however, collapsed in the 1920s, as David Runciman has shown.[10] Catholics were left bearing the torch of "anti-étatisme" and "natural political communities."

This was for good, and properly political, reasons. While we can remain agnostic about the Church's claims to eternality, its interventions on earth forced it into the same nitty-gritty politics as everyone else. In Part I, I will investigate Catholic anti-étatisme as it developed in response to domestic crises in the early 1920s. The "transnational Catholicism" that we know from the present had yet to develop, and Catholics operated in three more-or-less independent *milieux* (one of the few articles on German Catholic life to appear in the French press, characteristically, was rife with misspellings and made the absurd claim that most Catholic students were xenophobic pan-

[10] David Runciman, *The Personality of the State* (Cambridge, 1997), 132 (for the Figgis quotation), Chapter 10 (on the collapse of pluralism).

Germanists)[11]. These will be covered in the three chapters that make up Part I: one on France, one on the Rhineland, and one on Central Europe/*Mitteleuropa*. In each case, the Catholic contribution to the regional political-social discourse will be placed in the context of the liberal and socialist responses at work in those same regions. The Catholic contribution is only legible when read alongside its competitors—a general principle that will be followed throughout the dissertation.

By pointing out the continuities in Catholic social and political thought between the 1920s and 1950s, I do not seek to downplay the extent of the transformation: Catholics themselves were, as always, wont to point out the long heritage of their own beliefs, and we must not take them at face value. The Catholics of the 1920s were desperately opposed to parliamentary democracy, and they built an imposing political-cultural edifice devoted to its dismantling. The ecclesiastical hierarchy remained enthralled by visions of a bucolic, pre-revolutionary order in which women, Jews, and others would return to their putatively traditional roles: one need only look to the hierarchy's dismal record in the 1930s and 1940s to see how deeply opposed to parliamentary democracy they truly were. This atmosphere of reaction survived into civil-society groups, too: as we'll see, employer's federations and scouting movements were infused with anti-democratic values and practices.

None of this is news, however: we all know that interwar Catholics were a reactionary bunch, and there is no need to add another dissertation chronicling Catholic contributions to Nazism in Germany, "Austro-fascism" in Austria, or Vichyite policies in France. This ground has been well-plowed, and rightly so. What historians understand far less well is the linkage between

[11] P. Waline, "Quelques aspects du catholicisme allemand," *Revue des Jeunes* 11 (1921), 534-49. These *milieux* generally operated independently, but were obviously not hermetically sealed from one another; the bare realities of university politics often sent intellectuals from one region to another, while there were always *outré* figures at work (we might think of Johannes Messner, a solidarist in Vienna, or Franz Xaver Landmesser, a universalist in the heart of the Rhineland). I should note, also, that Catholicism had been more transnational in the past, too: in the pre-1914 period, social Catholics in particular had maintained a robust interest in one another's work, as a glance through the leading French social Catholic journal, *Mouvement social*, makes clear (characteristically, this journal ceased production in 1914 and was not revived).

these forms of Catholicism and the Christian Democracy *à venir*. This dissertation will focus on this longer trajectory, which will lead me to emphasize different institutions and individuals than if I were to be fundamentally interested in the Catholic contribution to far-right politics in the interwar period. This does not at all mean, though, that I will be focusing on the handful of left-wing, pro-democratic Catholics: on the contrary, there were continuities between the "vital center" of interwar Catholicism and its postwar successor. The shape that this postwar successor took is marked indelibly the experience of war and reconstruction, as well as the new geopolitical alignments of the late 1940s. But this, too, we already know. It was also—and this is my contribution—indelibly marked by the Catholic experience of the 1920s and 1930s.

In these chapters, I will be focusing on domestic politics: these were the crucible of Catholic political culture. I will be looking at Catholicism, that is, as a "bottom-up" phenomenon, generated from local conditions and local *intelligentsia* instead of by the Vatican. Of course, the Vatican was relevant, but it is important to recall that the popes of the interwar periods were not the mediatized popes of the post-Vatican II era: the Pope was not yet a media icon, and local political cultures were shaped more by local concerns than by the Vatican. It is worthwhile here, though, to describe the Vatican's ambiguous place in the Versailles order. Take the League, for instance, which more than any other institution symbolized that order. In stark contrast to Pius XII's relations to the United Nations, Popes Benedict XV and Pius XI essentially ignored the League. Although there were a few overtures in 1921-22, Geneva did not welcome Rome's intervention, and the Vatican did not attempt to join the League after acceding to statehood in 1929.[12] Pius XII, in his major encylical on foreign relations, *Ubi arcano Dei* (1922), evinced great skepticism of the League (reversing the cautious optimism of Benedict XV in *Pacem, Dei munus* (1919)). The encyclical was, it should be said, dismissive of everything that was going on in Europe and the world; it reads somewhat like *The*

[12] Paul G. Steinbicker, "The Papacy and the League of Nations," *Irish Monthly* 64 (1936), 369-75.

Waste-Land if Eliot had been more interested in educational policy. But the sections on international affairs leave no doubt that the League's bankruptcy had already, in Pius's mind, been demonstrated:

> Since the close of the Great War individuals, the different classes of society, the nations of the earth have not as yet found true peace. […] Nor has this illusory peace, written only on paper, served as yet to reawaken similar noble sentiments in the souls of men. […] No merely human institution of today can be as successful in devising a set of international laws which will be in harmony with world conditions as the Middle Ages were in the possession of that true League of Nations, Christianity.

Catholics throughout the continent followed the Vatican's lead. "The League is a miscarriage, which wants to be loved despite its origins," declared Friedrich Schreyvogl, editor of *Abendland*, one of Catholic Europe's most distinguished and widely-read journals.[13] Yves Simon recalled that one had to "jeer at the League of Nations" in order to be taken seriously in 1920s French Catholic circles, while a characteristic article in *Revue des Jeunes*, a central journal of the Catholic youth movement, worried that France would end up dissolving its identity and becoming merely the "20th republic of the League of Nations."[14]

There was certainly some Catholic support for the League, primarily from conservatives who believed that Geneva could be turned towards Catholic visions of Western Christendom.[15] Some in the hiearchy, notably the bishops of Geneva and Arras, attempted to corral their coreligionists into support for the League. The *Union catholique d'études internationales* was formed to secure Catholic influence on the League, under the presidency of the Swiss Catholic, Gonzague de Reynold. His career, though, indicates how far removed from the Geneva mainstream even these Catholics were:

---

[13] Friedrich Schreyvogl, "Genf und der abendländische Gedanke," *Abendland* 1, 7 (April 1926), 210-11, here 211.

[14] Yves Simon quoted Eugen Weber, *Action Française* (Stanford, 1962), 224; José Vincent, "La France divisée en régions," *Revue des jeunes* 9 (1919), 41-53, here 50.

[15] No study exists of Catholicism and the League of Nations. There are studies, from Wolfram Kaiser and Guido Müller, of the "Secrétariat International des Parties Démocratiques d'Inspiration Chrétienne," a small, pro-League, Christian-Democratic organization. Müller, though, emphasizes the utter marginality of these figures. Guido Müller, "The Anticipated Exile of Catholic Democrats: The Secrétariat International des Parties Démocratiques d'Inspiration Chrétienne," in *Political Catholicism in Europe*, *1918-1945,* 251-64.

Reynold was a reactionary aristocrat, who would go on to support Mussolini, Maurras, and Salazar. He believed in a new transnational Europe to come that would return to the roots of *Romanitas* and eschew liberal democracy. Maurice Barrès is another example here: no friend of the League, and a staple of the right-wing, he nonetheless wrote in praise of Geneva in 1920—precisely as the means through which the Rhineland could be returned to France! So, in the absence of any real work on Catholic relationships to the League, I want to suggest here that true support for Geneva was marginal, and much of it was, as in the case of Reynold and Barrès, contingent and strategic.[16]

Catholic suspicion of the League of Nations was of a piece with the continent-wide allergy to the new democratic republics. The problem was not *formal*: in principle, Catholics supported the idea of international federalism. The issue with Geneva, as Catholics from across the continent argued, was that it remained wedded to the same nation-state principles that it claimed to overthrow. "The sovereign state," a leading scholar of international relations has judged, "was the only source of the League's power. There could be no authority above that of the state."[17] The solution to the Rhenish crisis, which dominated European statecraft in the early 1920s, was complex and contested, but participants then and later historians agree that the nation-state remained the horizon of political expectations. The Rhineland was destined, according to Versailles, to return to a sovereign nation-state, be it France or Germany (the Saar region would decide this via plebiscite). There were no serious plans to solve the fundamentally economic issue via supranational economic planning, or any other form of drastic upending of nation-state sovereignty.

---

[16] Even Yves de la Brière, probably the most important French Catholic League-supporter, hedges his bets: if only, he cried, Catholics could be as active at the League as secularists and masons! Yves de la Brière, "La Cinquieme Assemblée de la Société des Nations: sécurité, arbitrage, désarmement," *Etudes* 61, 19 (October 1924), 100-115, here 101. Christian Democrats, marginal as they were, tended to support the League, too: Luigi Sturzo and Marc Sangnier championed it, as did Paul Archambault and the ill-starred Matthias Erzberger.

[17] Zara Steiner, *The Lights that Failed* (New York, 2005), 349.

Catholics were deeply interested in the Rhenish question. The region had already assumed a prominent place in Catholic life and thought before 1919: it had, for instance, served as a synecdoche of German nationhood for many since the Napleonic Wars and the burst of enthusiasm known as *Rheinromantik*.[18] Conveniently overlooking the Rhine's contribution to the events of 1848, Catholics were wont to wax poetic about the Rhineland as the ancient heart of *Abendland*, where Charlemagne had ruled a continent not yet divided by the all-too-human borders of the nation-state.[19] "The Rhenish problem long ago ceased being a French-German problem, or even a European one," declared one Catholic resident in 1922. "It is, rather, a question for the world."[20]

Catholics, who were opposed to the national projects enshrined in both the French and German republics, robustly opposed this solution, and the chapters that follow will each begin with the solution particular to that chapter's *milieu*. As we'll see, all Catholic *milieux* were opposed to the League's handling of the crisis, in general insofar as it ratified the nation-state principle, and in particular insofar as the final settlement was a boon for Weimar Germany, the national project that more than any other aroused Catholic ire. They each had different solutions, however, which are indicative of the different approaches to political order that were at work in each region. "The problem of the Rhineland and the problem of Europe," declared a German Catholic political pamphlet in 1924, "are tightly bound up with one another."[21] In the next three chapters, we will see how.

---

[18] Thomas Lekan, "A 'Noble Prospect': Tourism, *Heimat*, and Conservation on the Rhine, 1880-1914," *Journal of Modern History* 81, 4 (2009), 824-58, esp. 832-4.

[19] For a particularly lyrical version, see Hermann Platz, *Deutschland-Frankreich und die Idee des Abendlandes* (Köln, 1924)

[20] Heinrich Staab, "Das Programm des guten Rheinländers," *Allgemeine Rundschau* 19, 23 (10 June 1922), 266-7, here 266.

[21] Anonymous, unpaginated foreword in Hermann Platz, *Deutschland-Frankreich und die Idee des Abendlandes*.

Chapter 1: France: Jacques Maritain and the Despotism of the Social

Without a doubt, Catholicism, and Catholicism alone, resists.
--Charles Maurras, 1905[1]

We are faced with the question of statistics.
--M. Rigaux (social Catholic), 1912[2]

Jacques Maritain, the most brilliant and prominent Catholic intellectual of interwar France, tended to avoid specific policy recommendations. He was, he claimed, only interested in politics from the standpoint of redemption. He made an exception for Germany, though. Throughout his career he gave multiple thoughts about the shape of the Germany *à venir*. The German issue was not a political one, strictly speaking, but a metaphysical or theological one. Charles Maurras, the neo-royalist who headed the French right during these years, theorized "the *constant* historical disorder of Germany": for him, the nation *defined* disorder. "Disorder," he claimed, was "the intellectual and moral characteristic of Germany."[3] Maritain, for his part, delivered a widely noted lecture series during the war devoted to demolishing German thought. Like Maurras, Germany was not seen simply an unpleasant neighbor, but as a metonym for everything troubling about modernity itself. "Modernism," Maritain held, "is of Germanic origin."[4] Politically, this meant that the German project had to be abolished. "The nature of things," Maritain declared, "seems to demand that Germany be divided into multiple states."[5]

Maritain here gave voice to a more widespread French horror at a resurgent Germany. With their fellows on the right of the political spectrum, Catholics tended to think that a European peace

---

[1] Charles Maurras, *L'Avenir de l'Intelligence* (Paris, 1905), 12.

[2] M. Rigaux, "La lutte contre le chomage," *Le Mouvement Social* 74 (1912), 591-619, here 597.

[3] Maurras, "Gaulois, Germains, Latins," *Revue Universelle* 27 (Oct-Dec 1926), 385-419, 407 passim.

[4] Maritain, *Oeuvres Complètes*, ed. Cercle d'études Jacques et Raïssa Maritain, Vol. I (1986), 906.

[5] Ibid. 1082.

would not be possible until the German pips had squeaked. Politically, this meant a total dismembering of the Second Reich.[6] With the exception of Maurice Barrès—who had a somewhat mystical attachment to the region, and fervently believed that it should return to French hands[7]—they were primarily concerned about the danger to world peace posed by a united Germany. Their political goal was a total dismemberment of the nation, which would turn the Prusso-centric *Reich* back into a cluster of harmless city-states. So when it came to the Rhineland, the most prominent Catholic position—as announced in *L'Action Française* and in *Revue Universelle*—was Rhenish independence. The *Action Française* newspaper publicized the Rhenish independence movement, regretting that the drafters of the Versailles treaty had neglected to understand that a unitary German state could only exist under the jackboots of Prussia.[8] Meanwhile, a stream of articles in *Revue Universelle*, the Action française's cultural journal, defended Rhenish independence as the only way to guarantee a stable European peace.[9]

To understand the French Catholic rejection of the German nation-state, we must examine their principled rejection of the nation-state principle, as such, and their belief that authority should be delegated as far from the unitary nation-state as possible. Of course, this was conditioned by their precarious position in the France of the anti-clerical Third Republic.[10] The Dreyfus Affair and the

---

[6] Of course, many in France were opposed to the German menace, in the metaphysical sense, including humanists like Bergson. On this, see Ory and Sirinelli, *Les intellectuels en France, de l'affaire Dreyfus à nos jours* (Paris, 2002), Chapter 3.

[7] Maurice Barrès, *La Génie du Rhin* (Paris, 1921). On this stream of opinion, see Norbert Oellers, "Vom separatistischen zum französischen Rheinland: Wie sich Maurice Barrès ein friedliches Europa vorstellte," in Gertrude Cepl-Kaufmann, et al, eds., *Krieg und Utopie* (Essen, 2006), 327-31.

[8] Anonymous, "Le mouvement separatiste rhénan," *L'Action Française* 13, 31 (31 January 1920), 3.

[9] Jacques Bardoux, "Politique allemande, Politique rhénane," *Revue Universelle* 8 (1922), 475-93; W. Morton-Fullerton, "Comment s'est faite la Paix," *Revue Universelle* 6 (1921), 385-414; René Johannet, "Les deux Allemagnes," *Revue Universelle* 12 (1923), 524-30; Paul Le Faivre, "Notre attitude sur le Rhin," *Revue Universelle* 15 (1923), 282-6.

[10] This is not apparent from the extant literature, which has focused to an absurd degree on minor, Christian Democratic currents. In the absence of synthetic accounts of political Catholicism, the standard work appears in two recent edited collections: in each case, the article on France focuses almost exclusively on the *Parti Démocrate Populaire*, which never received more than three per cent of the vote. Jean-Claude Delbreil, "Christian Democracy and Centrism: The Popular

policies of the Waldeck-Rousseau and Combes administrations, culminating in the Briand-shepherded Law of Separation (1905), forced Catholics into the public sphere in a new way. This had deep roots: the Catholic Counter-Revolution had retained a strong voice throughout much of the nineteenth century, while Catholicism was a major, if largely overlooked, player in socialist movements, too.[11] France remained a largely rural country, and the peasantry remained ensconced in their Catholic milieu. Meanwhile, especially after 1848 and 1870, increasing numbers of the bourgeoisie turned to the Church as a bastion of order.[12] The French nation-building project of the *fin de siècle*, as Caroline Ford has shown in her case study of Brittany, was not a secularizing, Parisian project as Eugen Weber and others had imagined—on the contrary, Catholicism and French nationhood interacted in all sorts of ways.[13]

Two pre-1914 phenomena in particular deserve our attention as precursors of the interwar efflorescence of Catholic thought and political action (I will only register their presence in this moment, and then dwell on their political theories as they were manifested in the 1920s). First, social Catholicism, which was based primarily in the provinces (notably in Lille and Lyon).[14] While it might not be surprising that peasants and employers clung to Catholicism throughout the long nineteenth century, recent research has indicated that many workers, too, remained close to the Church. Even

---

Democratic Party in France," in *Political Catholicism in Europe, 1919-1945*, 95-110; James McMillan, "France," in *Political Catholicism in Europe, 1918-1965* (1996), 34-68.

[11] Edward Berenson, *Populist Religion and Left-Wing Politics in France, 1848-51* (Princeton, 1984).

[12] Ralph Gibson, *A Social History of French Catholicism, 1789-1914* (New York 1989); Thomas Kselman*, Miracles and Prophecies in Nineteenth-Century France* (New Brunswick, 1983).

[13] Caroline Ford, *Creating the Nation in Provincial France* (Princeton, 1993); Sarah Curtis, *Educating the Faithful* (Dekalb, IL, 2000).

[14] See *Cent ans de catholicisme social à Lyeon et en Rhône-Alps*, ed. Jean-Dominique Durand, et al. (Paris, 1992), for an excellent overview.

in Paris, the heart of secular, proletarian France, seventy percent of the population insisted on a Catholic burial in 1905 (keeping in mind that French socialism provided its own burial rituals).[15]

French social Catholicism is rooted in the work of Count René de la Tour du Pin and Count Albert du Mun, two aristocratic military officers who, after France's 1870 defeat, dedicated themselves to renewing the Church and reviving France. They founded a network of Catholic Workmen's Clubs in 1871, which had grown to include sixty thousand members by 1900. Through strategic alliances with Catholic industrialists, social Catholicism became enormously successful: a moderately-successful political party (*Action Libérale Populaire*) existed alongside a number of important journals, a staggeringly prolific propaganda and information bureau (the *Action populaire*), and a whole complex of trade unions, industrial federations, youth leagues, and consumer leagues. Intellectually, the *Semaines Sociales*, a yearly study meeting founded in 1904, was the most important institution of social Catholicism: it regularly brought together, with the papal blessing, a bevy of Catholic social scientists, who would speak to hundreds of Catholic priests, union organizers, officials in mutual aid societies, and other lay activists. As we'll see in more detail below, social Catholics were at the forefront of social-scientific investigation: their *Guide social* published inquiries into living conditions amongst Catholic workers, and the responses they got indicated that they were not only wagging questionnaires in people's faces, but introducing them to the new social imagination of the early twentieth century.[16] They insisted, though, that man does not live by bread alone and that their work was as much moral as scientific. "The Church," declared one social

---

[15] Thomas Kselman, "The Varieties of Religious Experience in Urban France," in *European Religion in the Age of Great Cities, 1830-1930*, ed. Hugh McLeod (New York, 1994), 165-90.

[16] One surveyor recalled the suspicion he met when interviewing workers in Toulouse. "What interest," they wondered, "could I have in their salaries? Did I not have some personal stake?" And, like other social investigators from London to Berlin, he marveled at the sights and smells of the workers' dwellings. "L'Enquête," *Guide Social 1908* (Reims, 1908), 9-13, here 9-19.

Catholic writer in 1912, "has descended to the social terrain […] in order to win it for true civilization."[17]

Second, the pre-1914 years demonstrated the new salience of Catholicism for France's intellectual class, headquartered as always in Paris. A famous generational survey *cum* manifesto, *Les jeunes gens d'aujourd'hui*, sounded the alarm: the old republican pieties were succuming to a "Catholic renaissance" among the youth.[18] The Dreyfusard spirit that had inflamed, and even created, the Parisian intelligentsia began to crumble in the face of the scandals of the rigorously anti-clerical administrations of Waldeck-Rousseau and Combes. Georges Sorel and Charles Péguy, strident Dreyfusards, moved to the right and begin flirting with more reactionary solutions. Léon Daudet, the son of the great republican novelist Alphonse Daudet, disowned his heritage and joined Charles Maurras, France's most notorious and influential royalist: "the Catholic religion and the philosophy of Saint Thomas Aquinas," he wrote of these years, was used by him and others to "slake the thirst for the Infinite which assails the human being between the ages of twenty and thirty."[19] Other prominent Parisian intellectuals, including the popular historian Jacques Bainville and the art historian Louis Dimier, flocked to Maurras's side, as well. The *Action française* emerged in these years as the right's most important voice: French reaction was no longer identified with doddering provincial aristocrats, but with the proto-fascist dynamism of the *Camelots du roi*, stalking the streets of Paris and hawking the party newspaper.

Daudet was not the only blue-blooded republican to join the ranks of reaction in these years. Jacques Maritain was born into a Protestant family in 1882, and in his early years showed every indication of becoming a leading republican intellectual. He was the grandson of Jules Favre, one of

---

[17] G. Desbuquois, "L'action sociale catholique," *Le Mouvement Social* 74 (1912), 672-702, here 672.

[18] Agathon [i.e. Massis and de Tarde], *Les jeunes gens d'aujourd'hui*, ed. Jean-Jacques Becker (Paris, 1995), Chapter 4.

[19] Léon Daudet, *Memoirs*, ed. and trans. Arthur Griggs (New York, 1925), 181.

the Third Republic's leading statesmen, and began his career studying botany at German universities, then at the height of their intellectual dominance. During the Dreyfus Affair, he strongly supported Zola and Péguy, becoming closely associated with the latter. "It will be necessary," he exclaimed in 1899, "to raze the churches and wound the heart of the old believing woman."[20] But in 1906, he succumed to Daudet's "thirst for the Infinite" and converted to Catholicism along with his wife Raïssa, a Russian Jew. He quickly entered the mainstream of Catholic reaction, associating himself with the *Action française* from 1911 onwards. "We thank you," he wrote to Père Delatte, his spiritual director, "for having pointed out so clearly to us the venom of liberalism and for having provided an irrefutable historical justification for the disdain that every Catholic should feel instinctively, it seems to me, for all the diminutions, concessions, and vilenesses of modern times."[21]

During the war, Catholics became even more involved in public life, as the *union sacrée* brought them squarely into the national fold: in the real and symbolic trenches of World War I, religious differences were cast aside in the name of eternal France.[22] Catholics came out of the war with a new prestige, just as they would in 1945: in addition to the continuation of the *Semaines sociales* and the other pre-war social movements, they founded a bevy of Christian trade unions, *Équipes sociales*, scouting movements, and more. "The religious idea has returned to civic life," one prominent social Catholic announced in 1922.[23] These new groups tended to bask in the reflected glory of the many military heroes, notably Edouard de Castelnau, that took part. They also tended to

---

[20] Quoted Jacques Barré, *Jacques and Raïssa Maritain*, trans. Bernard Doering (South Bend, 2005), 39.

[21] Quoted Ibid. 101.

[22] For an analysis of the "everyday religion" in the trenches, see Annette Becker, *War and Faith* (Oxford, 1998). For an argument that the *union sacrée* and the burst of (not necessarily republican) nationalism sustained the French home front, see Jean-Jacques Becker, *Les Français dans la Grande Guerre* (Paris, 1980). For an important corrective to the Becker thesis, emphasizing the continuing, if muted, anti-clericalism of the left during the war, see James McMillan, "French Catholics: *Rumeurs infames* and the *Union Sacree*, 1914-1918," in *Authority, Identity, and the Social History of the Great War*, ed. Frans Coetzee and Marilyn Coetee (Providence, 1995), 113-132.

[23] Georges Goyau, quoted Cholvy and Hilaire*, Histoire religieuse de la France contemporaine,* tome 2, 259.

be apolitical. Following a trend set by the Vatican, most Catholic organizations satisfied themselves with protecting the rights and traditions of Catholicism without engaging in high-profile counter-revolutionary activity. The Catholic Scouts, for instance, emphasized their political agnosticism, and their official manual outlawed any political discussion at scout camps or meetings.[24]

That said, however, these movements certainly did not *celebrate* the republic, and, given the tenor of the times, were implicitly conservative or even antirepublican (the same scouting manual featured a medieval knight on its cover). Simone de Beauvoir recalled of her Catholic education in the 1920s that she had been taught the glory of Marie Antoinette and the profound evil of the *sans-culottes* and *tricoteuses*.[25] Castelnau himself founded the *Fédération Nationale Catholique* in response to the victory of Edouard Herriot's militantly anti-clerical *Cartel des gauches* in 1924. The F.N.C. was a Catholic organization that, while technically apolitical, served as the primary national organization of a Catholic culture that remained, as Philip Nord has written, "in critical opposition to the wider civic order, more intent on a reconquest of the public realm […] than on any form of power-sharing."[26] And while Castelnau himself favored the extreme right of the republican possibilities, many of the F.N.C.'s top brass, not to mention many of its hundreds of thousands of members, were associated with the *Action française*.[27]

---

[24] *Les scouts de France, principes, status, règlement intérieur*, 2nd edition (Paris, 1923), 17.

[25] Beauvior quoted in Nicholas Beattie, "Yeast in the dough? Catholic schooling in France, 1981-95," in *Catholicism, Politics, and Society in Twentieth-Century France*, ed. Kay Chadwick (Liverpool, 2000), 197-219, here 201.

[26] Philip Nord, "Catholic Culture in Interwar France," *French Politics, Culture & Society* 21, 3 (2003), 1-20, here 5.

[27] Kevin Passmore, "Catholicism and Nationalism: The Fédération républicain, 1927-1939," in *Catholicism, Politics and Society in Twentieth-Century France*, ed. Kay Chadwick (Liverpool, 2000), 47-72, here 50-1; Oscar Arnal, *Ambivalent Alliance* (Pittsburgh, 1985), 117-21.

The political face of Catholicism belonged, above all, to Maurras's royalist movement.[28] There were miniscule Christian Democratic parties, but their influence and popularity paled in comparison to Maurras's. Pascal Ory and Jean-François Sirinelli judge that the movement constituted one of the two basic poles of 1920s intellectual life, comparing its influence to that of the P.C.F. after 1945.[29] Nothing of the sort could plausibly be claimed for Christian Democracy, which enjoyed no prominent intellectual support and never surpassed three per cent of the national vote. Maurras's organization enjoyed the support of many in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, including Pope Pius X and prominent theologians like Louis Billot and Thomas Pègues.[30] Yves Simon claimed in 1922 that Catholic intellectuals were doomed to irrelevance if they did not associate themselves with Maurras: "An admission of democracy in such a climate exposed one to ironical and disdainful pity […] One had to speak of liberal errors with a superior air, scoff at liberty, equality, or fraternity."[31]

This is somewhat puzzling, especially as the Catholic-friendly *Bloc national* was in power until 1924. As Susan Pedersen has pointed out, Catholic social policies, premised on a corporatist critique of atomized individualism, were well-nigh indistinguishable from those of mainstream republican social ideals. Kristin Stromberg Childers, for instance, has shown that Catholic invocations of the

---

[28] This seems true despite the fact that it never became dominant electorally. It was, Robert Paxton concludes, " the largest single bloc of Catholic opinion, as best our feeble means can measure it." Robert Paxton, "France: The Church, the Republic, and the Fascist Temptation, 1922-1945," in *Catholics, the State, and the European Radical Right, 1919-1945*, ed. Wolff and Hoensch (New York, 1987), 67-91, here 76.

[29] Ory and Sirinelli, *Les intellectuels en France* (Paris, 2004), 126.

[30] Michael Sutton, *Nationalism, Positivism and Catholicism* (New York, 1982), Introduction. For an authoritative treatment of the "ramparts of orthodoxy" that Maurras built around the Action Française, see Jacques Prévotat, *Les Catholiques et l'Action française (1899-1939)* (Paris, 2001). For Domician theologians, specifically, who supported Maurras, see André Laudouze, *Dominicans Français et Action Française, 1899-1940* (Paris, 1989), esp. chapters 5-7. See Gerhard Besier and Francesca Piombo, trans. W.R. Ward, *The Holy See and Hitler's Germany* (New York, 2007), 3 for Pius X.

[31] Philippe Chenaux, *Entre Maurras et Maritain* (Paris, 1999); Simon quoted in Weber, *Action française*, 224.

père de famille were strikingly similar to those of non-Catholics.[32] As Venita Datta has pointed out, both Radicals and Catholics were speaking the language of the "organic": no simplistic determination of "individualistic" republicanism vs. "organic" Catholicism will do.[33] *Solidarisme*, the reigning social ideology of the radicals, emphasized local administrative control and—an abiding Catholic concern—the protection of private property. It rejected class conflict, and emphasized the *devoirs* that we all owe to the collective: like Catholics, radicals were interested in steering a path between individualism and collectivism. Social Catholics and solidarist Radicals had rubbed shoulders at the Musée Social, a center of reformist thinking with close ties to the government, and Catholic law professors like Raoul Jay were among France's leading proponents of worker's insurance (modeled on Bismarck's Germany).[34] There were, moreover, plenty of resources for Catholic republicanism, notably including the papal injunction to *Ralliement* in the 1890s and, more recently, the warm memories from the *union sacrée*. Albéric Belliot's authoritative *Manuel de sociologie catholique*, while of course not supporting socialism, at least claimed that it was superior to liberalism![35] Even in the 1920s, there were reasons to hope: the French state, for instance, reopened diplomatic relations with the Vatican and sent official representatives to the canonization of Joan of Arc.

To explain the widespread Catholic opposition to the republic, we must examine the precise shape that the republic was taking at the time by examining the ethical socialism of the Radical Party, judged by Ory and Sirinelli to be the other pole of 1920s French intellectual life. As Sanford Elwitt

---

[32] Susan Pedersen, *Family, Dependence, and the Origins of the Welfare State*, 64. In Chapter 5, she shows how Catholic doctrines of social welfare were employed by Catholic employers in the service of privately-run family welfare systems. Kristen Stromberg Childers, *Fathers, Families, and the State in France, 1914-1945* (London, 2003), Chapter 2.

[33] Venita Datta, *Birth of a National Icon* (Albany, 1999), Chapter 7.

[34] Janet Horne, *A Social Laboratory for Modern France* (Durham, 2002), 109ff.

[35] Belliot, *Manuel de sociologie catholique*, 4.

and Judth F. Stone have shown, Radicals were the dominant voices of the Third Republic, and they worked hard, both intellectually and politically, to stabilize bourgeois society through a program of social legislation.[36] Radicals conceived of the state, and its relationship to the new idea of "society," in terms that were unacceptable to Catholics. These precise Radical theories and policies conditioned the Catholic opposition, and not any abstract opposition to modernity or republican regimes. Charles Maurras, it bears repeating, was not even a Catholic: he was an outspoken agnostic whose master was not Christ or Aquinas, but Auguste Comte, the founder of French sociology. The debate between Radicals and Catholics was carried out in the language of society, and not that of politics.

As Judith Surkis has pointed out, the concept of the "social" arose in republican circles to provide a ballast of value for the Republic—a way to reject the bankrupt individualist tradition without ceding ground to socialism or royalism.[37] Emile Durkheim, of course, was the principal poet of the social. As a leading Dreyfusard, he had attempted to theorize a notion of "society" that would thread a particularly difficult needle. He, and his *confrères*, needed a way to counter anti-Dreyfusard accusations of bankrupt, liberal atomism, while also protecting the Kantian cosmopolitanism he saw as integral to the French national project. It is important to recall that the debate was taking pace from within the tradition of sociology, and was not staged between republican sociology and Catholic atavism. The two central players—Durkheim and Maurras—were self-declared disciples of Comte, and shared some central premises, most importantly the idea that religion was necessary to public cohesion.[38] The debatable issue was whether or not individualism itself could serve as this new religion. While Maurras saw republican individualism as anathema to properly sociological

---

[36] Sanford Elwitt, *The Third Republic Defended* (Baton Rouge, 1986); Judith F. Stone, *The Search for Social Peace* (Albany, 1985).

[37] Judith Surkis, *Sexing the Citizen* (Ithaca, 2006), 129; see also William Logue, *From Philosophy to Sociology* (Dekalb, Ill., 1983).

[38] Andrew Wernick, *Auguste Comte and the Religion of Humanity* (Cambridge, 2001).

religiosity, Durkheim disagreed. Catholicism, he claimed in the midst of the Dreyfus Affair, was "yesterday's religion" and in dire need of replacement by the "religion of humanity whose rational expression is the individualist morality."[39]

Durkheim's "individualism," he emphasized, was quite different from the desiccated Benthamite version. "In reality," he writes, "the religion of the individual is a social institution like all known religions."[40] In 1900, he delivered an address at the Exposition Universelle, as part of a series of lectures on the concept of *solidarité*, which Durkheim supported and which came to be known as the official social philosophy of the Third Republic.[41] He spoke alongside his friend and disciple, Léon Bourgeois. Bourgeois was probably the most significant Radical ideologue and politician of the Third Republic (excepting possibly the heroes of the 1870s). He was closely identified with the politics of Geneva, serving as president of the League Council and winning the 1920 Nobel Peace Prize for his efforts. And as the expositor of *solidarisme*, widely recognized as the Radicals' guiding, if loosely-defined, political ideology, his shadow loomed large over debates in the 20s.

Bourgeois brought Durkheimean ideas of the social into the heart of Radical political thinking. Like Durkheim, he was critical of both socialism and liberalism, believing that a socialized individualism could provide a just and efficient path between the two. The utility of *solidarisme*, as Bourgeois constantly emphasized, was that it allowed for a more equitable social order from within the framework of "individualism" and the principles of 1789. The basic idea was that man, as Durkheim taught, is social all the way down, tied from birth by a thousand strands to his community. This is true regardless of social policy. "There is a natural solidarity," Bourgeois believed, "which has nothing in common with justice." What solidarism tried to do was bend this

---

[39] Durkheim, "Religion and the Intellectuals," trans. and ed. Steven Lukes, *Political Studies* 17 (1969), 14-30, here 25.

[40] Ibid. 28.

[41] For Durkheim's complex relationship with solidarism, see Steven Lukes, *Emile Durkheim* (London, 1973), 350-4.

pre-existing solidarity towards just social relations. For this, conscious management and science are needed, as nature is not enough. Like Durkheim, Bourgeois was explicit that this new system would replace the religions of old. We need not wait for the endtimes for justice, Bourgeois writes: with the help of science and fair contracts, justice can appear on earth.[42]

This same elevation of the social can be found in the lengthy electoral manifesto prepared by the *Cartel des Gauches* in preparation for the fateful election of 1924. Like Bourgeois, the Cartel tried to claim the mantle of the French Revolution, praising Gambetta and Combes as anti-clerical forerunners. The Church was lumped together with high finance and high industry as a counter-revolutionary agent behind the nefarious *Bloc National*, while Lucien Lévy-Bruhl, a leading Durkheimean, contributed an essay on the "republican ideal."[43] Like Bourgeois and Durkheim, Lévy-Bruhl argued that the project of 1789 must become social: the people must be sovereign, but must also guarantee rights through social policies. The most interesting article in this regard came from Charles Rist, who argued for a form of economic corporatism that would be based on individualism—as mediated through the state and a proposed National Economic Council (which became a reality in 1925).[44]

The agents in each of these cases were the familiar republican agents: the male voter, the sovereign people, the republican state.[45] For all of the republican interest in corporate management, this was always on the national stage. Bourgeois's most controversial policy, for instance, was support of a sizable income tax to fund his programs. What is studiously missing from Durkheim, Bourgeois, and the *Cartel des Gauches* was a principled appreciation of subsidiary communities: the

---

[42] Léon Bourgeois, "L'idée de solidarité et ses conséquences sociales," in *Essai d'une philosophie de la solidarité*, ed. Bourgeois and Alfred Croiset (Paris, 1907), 1-120, here 46, 14, 17.

[43] Ch. Seignbobos, "Histoire du parti républicain," in *La politique républicaine*, 11-60, esp. 56-7.

[44] Lévy-Bruhl, "L'idéal républicain"; Charles Rist, "La politique économique," in Ibid., 271-300.

[45] For the significance of the male voter, see Surkis, *Sexing the Citizen*.

family, most notably, or the region. Natalism is not the same as principled defense of the family *qua* moral entity, as Radicals rejected conservative demands for family-based voting, and even female suffrage (on the grounds that women were too religious). Durkheim, for instance, was convinced that local or regional loyalties were atavistic and needed to be effaced in the name of a national community. "The patriotism of the parish," he wrote, "has become an archaism that cannot be revived at will."[46] "[T]he men of the Revolution," he instructed, "made France one, indivisible, centralized, and perhaps one should even see the revoutionary achievement as being above all a great movement of national concentration."[47] Elsewhere, he delivered a paean to the state as the "prime mover":

> It is the State that has rescued the child from patriarchal domination and from family tyranny; it is the State that has freed the citizen from feudal groups and later from communal groups; it is the State that has liberated the craftsman and his master from guild tyranny.[48]

From the Catholic perspective, these "liberations" were in fact enslavements, and it was the undermining of these traditional communities that most worried Catholics about the Republic. While French republicans were just as convinced as Catholics in the centrality of the social, their theories advocated a rational, scientific reconstruction of society to the detriment of natural or pre-existing communities (in this, of course, they were following a long revolutionary tradition). In the bellwether 1910 survey cited above, the authors declared, "The idea of national sovereignty, as it was conceived by the Revolution, is in crisis."[49] Philippe Ariès (an outspoken Catholic, then as later), recalling his youthful affiliation with the Action française, wrote that he "opposed the limited

---

[46] Quoted on Chernilo, *A Social Theory of the Nation-State* (New York, 2007), 51.

[47] Durkheim, "Individualism and the Intellectuals," 25.

[48] Durkheim, *Professional Ethics and Civic Morals*, trans. Cornelia Brookfield (New York, 2003) 64.

[49] Agathon, *Les jeunes gens d'aujourd'hui* 131n.

traditional community, the sense of solidary of a small group, to democratic individualism."[50] La Tour du Pin praised Maurras's movement for the same reason:

> You hold high the flag on which you have inscribed not only the restoration of the throne, that is to say, the liberty of the state, but all the other public liberties which have disappeared since the proclamation of individual liberty; liberty of the Church, of the province, of the commune, of the profession, of the family.[51]

From their perspective, these organic communities are both enjoined by nature and just in themselves. Catholics, both those in the *Action française* and those associated with social Catholicism, believed that the State should do no more than crown a natural and organic order, taking its place amongst a series of legitimate, natural, and ancient communities. As Maurras pointed out, there were differences between the Semaines Sociales and the Action Française, but they could rally behind a certain understanding of "the state and its functions."[52] And neither group sought to return to pre-scientific understandings of the social order. "If it is the sociologists who do not give morality its proper place," chided one social Catholic, "there are others who do not pay sufficient attention to the economic aspects of socio-economic problems."[53] Catholics sought to remain Catholic while also remaining scientific, and their writings, especially in the social-Catholic tradition, retained all of the social-scientific rigor they had developed in the *fin de siècle*.

But, as all agreed, science was not enough without morality, and the particular source of Catholic morality at this time was Thomism, which swept Catholic France—both social and royalist Catholics—in the 1920s. Leo XIII had called for a return to Thomas in 1879, and his call was met inside the seminaries. But after World War I, Thomism enjoyed an astonishing vogue in the public sphere, as lay intellectuals like Étienne Gilson, Auguste Valensin, and, above all, Maritain blew the

---

[50] Philippe Ariès, *Un historien du dimanche* (Paris, 1980). 52.

[51] This from a 1909 letter, quoted in Elbow, *French Corporative Theory, 1789-1848*, 119.

[52] Maurras, "La Politique," *L'Action Française* 15, 222 (10 August 1922), 1.

[53] G. Desbuquois, "L'action sociale catholique," 692.

cobwebs off of the medieval doctor and brought him into dialogue with modern culture and society. "This is the first time," Raïssa Maritain wrote in her journal, "that Thomist philosophy has had such a large entry into the world of culture."[54] Even, in one case, to the theater: Henri Ghéon, who wrote a well-received play with the inauspicious title, *The Triumph of St. Thomas*, explained, "We can take it for granted, following the urgent advice of Rome after sufficient examination, that the principles of Thomism are just, while those of Descartes and Kant are false."[55] Thanks to Ghéon, Maritain, new mass-audience courses at the Institut Catholique, a bevy of Thomist study circles, a mass of publications from the Thomist stronghold at Louvain, and so on, a generation of Catholics was raised in Thomas's shadow.[56]

It is no coincidence that Jacques Maritain was both one of the chief Action Française intellectuals and France's most famous Thomist: Aquinas and Maurras were closely allied in the 1920s. Maurras, in addition to publicizing Thomism in his newspaper and discussing the Church Doctor in his own monographs, enjoyed the support of Thomism's greatest luminaries.[57] Maritain edited the philosophy section of the *Revue Universelle*, the chief Catholic organ of the *Action française*, and he lent a Thomist flavor to the enterprise. Maritain was also one of the guiding spirits of *La Gazette française*, another Catholic journal in the orbit of *Action Française*, founded in 1924 (not

---

[54] Quoted on Chenaux, *Entre Maurras et Maritain* 34. See Stephen Schloesser, *Jazz Age Catholicism* (Buffalo, 2005), Part Two on all of this. Schloesser, it should be noted, overstates his case as to the "ultra-modernity" of these people: while opposition to democracy and Jewish influence are, regrettably, very modern, they are not so in the praiseworthy sense that Schloesser means. Maritain's ultra-modernity, for instance, is difficult to square with his dismissal of the theory of relativity as insufficiently realist.

[55] Ghéon quoted in a laudatory review of the play. Henri Rambaud, "Le thêatre: le *Triomphe de saint Thomas* d'Henri Ghéon," *Revue Universelle* 18 (1924), 507-9, here 508. Portions of the play were also reprinted in the Maurras-friendly *Gazette française*: Ghéon, "Le Triomphe de Saint Thomas," *La Gazette française* 1, 3 (14 June 1924), 1-2.

[56] Philipp Chenaux has admirably traced all of this in *Entre Maurras et Maritain*, Chapter 1.

[57] For Thomism in the *Action Française*, see, for instance, an anonymous review of R.P. Pègues, *La Somme théologiqe de Saint Thomas d'Aquin en forme de catéchisme, L'Action Française* 13, 34 (3 February 1920), 2; for a reference to Thomas in Maurras's work, see *Romantisme et Révolution* (Paris, 1923), 107. For Maurras's own clearest discussion of the link between Thomism and his own thought, see his lengthy preface to Jean-Louis Lagor, *La Philosophie politique de saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris, 1948).

coincidentally, the year of the Cartel des Gauches).[58] "We cannot imagine," Etienne Borne later recalled, "how Maurras was able to entrance and fascinate a large part of the Catholic intelligentsia, including cardinals and bishops."[59] Later historians have been unable to solve Borne's conundrum, and the links between Thomist philosophy and the Action Française remain understudied.[60]

When put into the propert context of Third Republic radicalism, Thomism's appeal as a discourse of anti-republicanism becomes apparent. Thomism's account of natural law allowed a way to reinstate the traditional communities and hierarchies that had always been fundamental to the counter-revolutionary imagination. As Maritain explained it, Thomism allowed Catholic to reassert the objective reality, and hierarchical ordering, of the natural and social world. This was homologous with Maurras's attempt to theorize a "realist politics, either Catholic or positivist."[61] Like Maurras and others, Maritain was convinced that Republicans were in thrall to a bankrupt, Kantian philosophy that denied the objective reality of the world in favor of the newly-minted "social." Kant was, of course, one of Durkheim's philosophical patron saints, as well as Maritain's primary *bête noir*. "Saint Thomas against Kant!" was the call to arms with which Maritain ended his wartime series of

---

[58] --, "Notre Programme," *La Gazette Française* 1, 15 (February 1925), 1. There were, of course, Catholics opposed to Thomism (notably Blondel and Laberthonnière), who happened to be Maurras's greatest theological opponents. They were also marginalized for the time being, as Philippe Chenaux points out.

[59] Letter from Borne to Prévotat, 11 December 1992, quoted Véronique Auzépy-Chavagnac, *Jean de Fabrègues et la Jeune Droite catholique* (Pas-de-calais, 2002), 90.

[60] Significantly, Peter Bernardi relegates this to a footnote. Jacques Prévotat, the author of the currently standard work on the Action Française, concludes that "the theologians who supported belonged primarily to the neo-Thomist school of theology," but he discusses this for only two of his book's five hundred pages, and primarily as a foil to the anti-Thomist theology of Blondel (Bernardi, *Maurice Blondel, Social Catholicism & Action Française* (Washington, 1999), 93n; Jacques Prévotat, *Les catholiques et l'Action française*, 218-20). The best books on the Action Française—those by Sutton and Weber—are interested in Catholics primarily insofar as they oppose Maurras, although of course this would not have mattered had not very many Catholics also supported him. Work on specifically Catholic intellectual history, on the other hand, has tended to focus on the post-26 period (see Bernard Doering, *Jacques Maritain and the French Catholic Intellectuals* (South Bend, 1983)) or avoid the political angle altogether (as in Schloesser, *Jazz Age Catholicism*).

[61] Joseph-Paul Boncour et Charles Maurras, *La République et la Décentralisation* (Paris, 1923), 88. This text originally from 1903.

lectures at the Institut Catholique, while Maurras declared Kantian idealism to be the "religion of the Third Republic. […] Intellectually, morally, ethically, [Kant] is the enemy."[62]

The issue was that Thomas theorized an ontology of *order*: the enormous centrality of "order" as a keyword in social thinking can be traced back to the Thomist revival (and would bear fruit later in neoliberalism, whose key early journal was called *Ordo,* in honor of Thomas). Philosophy, Maritain averred in 1920, is about attaining knowledge of being, "thanks to what is called the *natural light* of human intelligence."[63] This light allows us to see and be dominated by objects, whose "natural order" it is our duty as philosophers to uncover.[64] "Human intelligence," Maritain concluded, is "naturally made for being in general and without restriction."[65] Like Garrigou-Lagrange, the most prominent Thomist within the hierarchy itself, and one who profoundly influenced Maritain, Maritain held that the natural light of reason afforded us a *sens commun*—a "dowry of nature," as Maritain put it—that afforded all of us with "certitudes, which gush *spontaneously* in our spirit."[66] For both Maurras and Maritain, there is no such thing as Being without a hierarchy. In a world populated by objects, some order must prevail to avoid the anarchy of the Kantian world. This was a Thomist commonplace. As one Thomist wrote in *Revue Universelle* in 1924, "the world is a hierarchy of beings, intimately linked and ordered in such a way that reason can discover the connections."[67] Maurras was obsessed with what he called "the immense question of

---

[62] Jacques Maritain, *Oeuvres Complètes*, Vol. I, 1025; Charles Maurras, *Quand les français ne s'aimaient pas* (Paris, 1916). Auguste Valensin had already launched a Thomist critique of Kant in 1910. See "Le Criticisme Kantien," (1910) collected in *A Travers la Métaphysique* (Paris, 1925).

[63] Maritain, *Oeuvres Complètes* Vol. II, 103.

[64] Maritain, *Oeuvres Complètes* Vol. II, 105.

[65] Ibid. 977. This in *Antimoderne*, from a 1914 essay originally published in *Revue Thomiste*.

[66] Ibid. 131. For Garrigou-Lagrange on this, see Réginald Garrigou-Lagrange, *Le Sens Commun* (Paris, 1909, 1922).

[67] René Kremer, "Saint Thomas à la Sorbonne" *Revue Universelle* 19 (1924), 492-501, here 496. *Revue Universelle* was associated with the Action Française, and Maritain edited the philosophy section in which this article (a consideration of Gilson) appeared.

order."[68] In a 1922 article for *Revue Universelle*, Maritain approvingly cited Maurras's praise for the Church, and went on: "It is only in the Church, herald of supernatural order and safeguard of natural order among men, that order appears in plenitude, in its splendor and metaphysical purity." And, more darkly: "All order—including that among demons—is divine."[69] Maurras put it this way: "As soon as Being begins to distance itself from its opposite, as soon as Being exists, it has its force and its order."[70]

For both Maritain and Maurras, the problem with the Third Republic was that it denied this natural order in the name of the "social," which, as we have seen, structured Radical discourse and denied the existence of a natural social order. It was this specific context Maritain had in mind when, in a scathing discussion of Durkheim, he denounced the "despotism of the social."[71] The Republic, Maritain taught, wrenched "the human person", understood as the person embedded in a web of communities, from his natural habitat, transforming him into an "individual": "isolated, naked, with no social framework to support and protect it." This individual, excised from the warm embrace of fathers and patrons, "will be completely annexed to the social whole."[72] Maurras spoke in similar terms in his critique of "social individualism" (a perfectly just way to characterize the solidarist system): true liberty appears when "companies, *corps* and distinct groups […] remain master of their own regulations", while the false liberty of the republicans consists in abstract liberty, given to all "without taking into account their different functions."[73] For Maurras and Maritain, this "despotism

---

[68] Maurras, *Romantisme et Revolution* 100.

[69] Maritain, *Oeuvres Complètes* III, 1280.

[70] Maurras, quoted on Collette Peter*, Charles Maurras et l'idéologie d'Action Française* (Paris, 1972), 36, from *Mes idées politiques*.

[71] Maritain, *Oeuvres Complètes* I, 966.

[72] Ibid. 21.

[73] Maurras, *Romantisme et révolution*, 18.

of the social" was behind the paradoxical equation of individualism and tyranny. In a characteristic 1921 article, Maritain criticized European modernity because it deifies the individual, but *also* because it deifies the state; years earlier, he had vilified Rousseau for turning man into a "slave of the state."[74] Maurras felt the same way: "the republic is simultaneously individualist and *étatiste*."[75]

The Catholic critique of the "social" extended across the intellectual spectrum. Augustin Cochin, an Orléanist conservative with loose ties to the Action Française, was a favored historian of the Catholic right: both Maritain and Maurras were enamored of his work.[76] He made his name through his histories of the French Revolution, which, like Maritain and Maurras, he saw as a denial of reality in this special Thomist sense. "[I]t is necessary," he taught, "to distinguish between the *artificial* union founded on theories and the *real* union founded on facts."[77] We are naturally tied to one another, and to God, by innumerable and invisible strands, and once these are cut, as they were in 1789, the "people" will fill this space, assume Godlike powers, and institute a Reign of Terror. While this historical thesis has had a long afterlife, at the time it was employed as part of a wider Catholic critique of the Republic and the new legitimating language of the social. Durkheim, Cochin taught, simply reversed the polarity of Rousseau: "Rousseau divinized the people; Durkheim socialized God: God, pure symbol of the only reality, the social."[78] To take another example: Simon Deploige, a Thomist professor at Louvain, devoted an entire volume to criticizing Durkheim's

---

[74] Maritain, *Oeuvres Complètes*, Vol. II 1083 (this from Antimoderne, originally 1921). Maritain, *Oeuvres Complètes*, Vol. I 964.

[75] Boncour et Maurras, *La République et la Décentralisation* 88-9.

[76] For Maurras and Cochin, see Pierre Lafarge, "Les Sociétés de Pensée et la Démocratie Moderne," in *Le Trésor de l'Action française*, ed. Pierre Pujo (Lausanne, 2006), 31; Maurras, "La Politique," *L'Action Française* 13, 33 (13 February 1926), 1. In a long letter to Massis in 1914, planning the royalist journal that would eventually become *Revue Universelle*, Maritain fantasized that Cochin might serve as editor of the historical section. Jacques Maritain to Henri Massis, 3 April 1914, Maritain Archives, Archives of the Centre d'Etudes Jacques et Raïssa Maritain, Kolbsheim, France.

[77] Augustin Cochin, *La Révolution et la Libre-Pensée* (Paris, 1924), xxxii-xxxiii.

[78] Ibid. xlix.

sociology (Maritain wrote the preface to a new edition of the book, published by the Action Française's publishing house in 1923). Deploige sought to unravel the sociological notion that something called "society" could replace God as the source of moral value and political order: Deploige saw this merely as "social mysticism."[79] Society, as the "Grand Être" that both produces and watches over us, ends up enslaving us more fully than any feudal order.

The Social Catholics of the 1920s participated in the same discourse. Although they tended to support the Republic, they were as critical as Maurras and Maritain of the étatiste tendency to steamroll intermediary communities. Social Catholics and Maurrasean royalists were not at all warring factions, although they differed in emphasis: the Church, after all, blessed them both, while La Tour du Pin, one of social Catholicism's founding fathers, was a firm devotee of Maurras (while Maurras would call him "my direct master, master, I repeat it, of our social politics"[80]). Augustin Cochin was celebrated in both the social Catholic and the royalist press.[81] Deploige associated with the Action française while speaking at the *Semaines sociales* at the same time. More importantly, though, there were homologies between the political thought of the royalists and that of the social Catholics: each were rooted in the Thomist revival and its celebration of intermediary communities. Paul Archambault, a giant of progressive Catholicism in the 1920s, sought "our liberation from subjective individualism, without delivering us into fashionable *sociologisme*."[82] The 1922 *Semaines Sociales*, specifically on the economic role of the state, was peppered with references to Thomism,

---

[79] Simon Deploige, *Le conflit de la morale et de la sociologie* (Paris, 1912), 384.

[80] Quoted in Matthew Elbow, *French Corporative Theory, 1789-1848*, 79.

[81] For an old-guard social Catholic using Cochin against Herriot, see Georges Goyau, "Les sociétés de pensée," *La Vie Catholique* 1, 7 (15 November 1924), 1.

[82] This on the opening page of his most important collection of the period. Archambault, "Avant-Propos," in *La Cité moderne et les Transformations du Droit*, ed. Paul Archambault (Paris, 1925), v-vii, here v.

and its theory of intermediary bodies, as a critique of the centralizing, revolutionary state. "Sociology and economics," declared one Catholic writer, "are related to theology."[83]

The most important political thinkers of social Catholicism were the so-called "institutionalists": J.T. Delos, Maurice Hauriou, and George Renard. All three were concerned to devolve power away from the state and towards a series of intermediary "institutions." The State was tasked not with directing economic life, but with organizing and protecting an organic institutional milieu. Both Delos and Renard were staples of the *Semaines Sociales*, while Hauriou was the central inspiration behind the political thought of Eugène Duthoit, the president of the *Semaines*. Hauriou had developed a notion of law that could, as he himself argued, overcome the Durkheimean idea of the social.[84] Duthoit argued that the contemporary French state was seriously overstepping its bounds, and needed to withdraw in the face of subsidiary communities. "It is a […] fact," Duthoit announced, "that the state is not adapting to its economic functions as it should." As Tocqueville had foreseen, war had caused the state to balloon and encroach on territory that is not its own, intervening into local realities with its clumsy, visible hand. All of these difficulties collapse into one: Duthoit's diagnosis, shared with Maritain, is that the state "is fundamentally unaware of its true nature." The State should not abolish all other communities, or even conceive of itself as an independent force at all. It is no more than the "superstructure" that organizes and protects the infrastructure: provinces, départements, communes, corporations, families, and so on. The State is "a power of envelopment, and not one of absorption." [85]

---

[83] Et. Lajeunie, O.P., "Vie sociale et vie spirituelle", *La Vie Spirituelle* 11 (1923-4) 182-5, here 185.

[84] Hauriou, "La Théorie de l'Institution et de la Fondation," in *La Cité moderne et les Transformations du Droit*, 1-45, here 7.

[85] Duthoit, "Comment adapter l'Etat à ses fonctions economiques," *Le role économique de l'état (Semaines Sociales de France, XIVème session)* (Lyon, 1922), 33-60, here 35, 37, 45, 48.

It is worth dwelling on a particular manifestation of this idea that would have tremendous, and surprising, staying power: the "human person," or *la personne humaine*, as opposed to the "individual." Like Catholic social thought more broadly, Catholic personalism only makes sense when placed in the context of Third Republic republicanism. For while Catholics were keen to cite the term's Thomist heritage, the more proximate source was the Republic itself. In his work on suicide, Durkheim announced that "the human person is and must be considered something sacred," while in his 1898 intervention into the Dreyfus Affair he had used the "human person" to name the social individual he was theorizing. "In the modern world, in the world of the Revolution," Jean Jaurès announced in 1903, "law begins with the human person" (this was met with cheers from the left wing of the Chamber of Deputies). The following year, he defended "the right of the human person to unlimited liberty of thought and belief."[86] In the 1920s, too: Lévy-Bruhl, in his essay for the *Cartel des Gauches* manifesto, proclaimed that the Republic was charged with protecting the development of the "human person."[87]

So while republicans were arguing that the socialized "human person" was a mere development *from* individualism, Catholics responded that individualism, as defended by Durkheim, in fact represented the denial of the socialized "human person." This argument was made from across the Catholic spectrum, although Social Catholics writing around the time of the Law of Separation seem to have been the first to make this move. Royalists were quick to follow suit: Augustin Cochin used the "human person" as a stick with which to beat modern political ideas in

[86] Paul Deschanel, Jean Jaurès, and André Ribot, *Le budget et la politique étrangère de la France: Discours prononcés à la Chambre des Députés du 19 au 29 janvier 1903* (Paris, 1903), 169; *Annales de la Chambre des Députés* (Paris, 1904), 704.

[87] Lévy-Bruhl, "L'idéal républicain," 71.s

1909, while Maritain did so in 1914.[88] In the 1920s, the concept became firmly embedded in Catholic discourse, from which point it would, as we'll see in following chapters, take on a life of its own.[89]

Maritain did more than anyone else to make the concept famous. The notion of the person is, Maritain proudly claims, a legitimately Thomist one. Essentially it adds nothing to the ontological status of man as described above: the possession of rationality and the ability to consciously and morally dwell in the hierarchy of being stretching from man to God. The individual, by contrast, is like a plant or animal, motivated by unconscious instinct and ignorant of the spark of divine rationality in his soul. "As individuals," Maritain rhapsodizes, "we are subject to the stars. As persons, we rule them."[90] In other words, a true person is not subject to the whims of brute matter, but soars above it—at least in spirit—through the possession of reason.

Both historically and conceptually, the notion is rooted in a realist, federalist critique of the modern state: the "person" was not a hoary Thomist idea that Maritain dusted off in the name of federalist politics, but was created in that context, and for that (political) reason. Here's Maritain in 1923:

> In the social order, the modern city sacrifices the *person* to the *individual*; it gives universal suffrage, equal rights, liberty of opinion, to the *individual*, and delivers the *person*, isolated, naked, with no social framework to support and protect it, to all the devouring powers which threaten the soul's life.[91]

The resonance with the federalist politics described above should be obvious: the person, as a denizen of an acephalous reality ("social framework"), has been transformed into an atomized mass man who can be dominated by the "devouring powers" of the state. The only solution, as Maritain

---

[88] Augustin Cochin, *La Crise de l'histoire révolutionnaire* (Paris, 1909), 51; Maritain, *Oeuvres Complètes*, I, 964.

[89] For an early example, see Abbé de Pascal, "L régime des échanges," *Semaine Sociale de France, IIIème session* (Lyon, 1906), 79-88, here 79.

[90] Maritain, *Three Reformers* (Westport, 1970), 21.

[91] Ibid. (this article was originally written two years earlier)

pointed out elsewhere, is a return to a more local, federalist and customary notion of legitimacy and law.[92]

What, though, does this all have to do with "democracy"? Recall my basic hypothesis that Catholics were not greatly exercised by the question of democracy in the abstract—a contention that is, I believe, borne out by my analysis above, which looks at French Catholicism as a whole and finds a coherent set of social guidelines without dwelling on the "democracy vs. monarchy" question. Many French Catholics were monarchists, of course, but very few of them were willing to theorize a *natural* connection between monarchism and Catholicism (there were exceptions: Garrigou-Lagrange, for one). This simply was not the tenor of Catholic thinking. Christian Democrats like Archambault, who believed in full-throated Catholic participation in the republic, were in the minority. Charles Maurras, whose cry of "Politique, d'abord!" seems to fly in the face of this thesis, was of course not Catholic, nor were many of his central intellectual backers (Léon Daudet, Pierre Lasserre, et al.). The disagreement beween Maurras and Archambault was not about democracy in the abstract—it was about the *capacity* of democracy to instantiate the social form that Catholics truly desired. Maurras and Archambault shared the desire for a decentralized, regionalist social and economic order: they differed in the belief of the former that democracy was incapable of creating it.

In closing, let's look at Jacques Maritain, the key Catholic intellectual of the *Action Française*, and *Revue Universelle*, the central *Catholic* organ of *Action Française* activism. The *Revue* was very Catholic but it was not, in any way, a royalist journal. Indeed, in the 1920s it published no articles in support of the monarchy. This is a remarkable fact, and a very difficult one to explain away if one believes that 1920s French Catholics were dyed-in-the-wool monarchists: the central organ for French Catholic intellectuals, one allied with the right-wing of French politics, did not support

[92] Maritain, *Oeuvres Complètes*, III, 181-204

monarchism in any way. It published a great many articles about social Catholicism, the dangers of centralization, the dangers of "sociology" and Radicalism, the menace of a united Germany, and more of the Catholic concerns that I've outlined above. But the *Revue* did not dabble in questions of political form.[93] Maritain, likewise, emphasized the difference between *démocratie*, a legitimate political form found in the works of Thomas and Aristotle, and *démocratisme*, a bankrupt, centralizing form of democratic politics at work in Prussia and in French Radicalism.[94] Catholics were more interested in the reform of society. Belliot, the Catholic sociologist, in 1927 listed seven institutions that would be "the most useful for the *integral reform of society*." The state did not appear on this list.[95]

Does this mean that French Catholicism was primed for parliamentary democracy? Of course not: French Catholics, for the most part, were anti-republican to their marrow, and many would turn to explicitly anti-democratic solutions in the 1930s and early 1940s. Belliot, again, is paradigmatic here: he was scathing towards "parliamentarism" and linked it directly with the bureaucratization and centralization that had dissolved the proper corporate order. Simultaneously, though, he was careful to admit that in certain times and places, democracy might be the proper political order.[96] There was a long and winding road between the reactionary Catholicism of the 1920s and the Cold War Catholicism of the 1940s. What I've done in this chapter, though, is revise the traditional understanding of 1920s Catholicism: it was as opposed to the Republic as we always believed, but for different reasons. Catholics were less interested in questions of political form than of social form; less interested in political theory than in economics. Once we see this, the *nature* of the Catholic transition to democracy snaps into focus—we no longer see a picture of Catholics

---

[93] Christine Foureau, *La revue universelle (1920-1940): aux origines intellectuelles du pétainisme* (Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1999), 7.

[94] This was before his break with Maurras. Maritain *Oeuvres Complètes*, vol. III, 753-4

[95] Belliot, *Manuel de sociologie catholique* 590.

[96] Ibid. 402ff, 579.

waking up and smelling the roses of democracy, but a more nuanced one, in which Catholics, interested in reproducing a certain social form, were casting about for the best political means to arrive there. In the 1920s, monarchism seemed the natural answer to this problem. In the 1930s, as we'll see in Part II, many turned towards authoritarian and non-monarchist Fascism. And, in the 1940s, to democracy itself.

Chapter 2: Eugen Kogon and the Democracy of Tomorrow

The sovereign state, in the modern sense, tends towards the world-state, and it wishes to become the Church, the last unified source of value. Phrased apocalyptically: it bears the Antichrist in its womb! --Ernst Karl Winter, 1926[1]

French Catholics were not the only ones terrified of the crusading nation-state, and they were not the only ones to see Prussia as its most dangerous manifestation. They were joined by an active culture of Catholics in central Europe, primarily in Bavaria and Austria. Here, as in France, Catholics set up their own, putatively ancient, traditions as a bulwark against the Prussian machine, which represented "modernity" in all its most frightening guises. There was very little connection between the two *milieux* at the time—understandably, French and German-speaking Catholics had little to say to one another in the days immediately succeeding the Second World War. They relied, though, on a shared heritage of nineteenth-century social thinking, and a shared fear that the nation-state, *arriviste* in Vienna but well-entrenched in France, was running roughshod over the Church's ancient liberties. The traditions were somewhat different, however, and would therefore make different contributions to the transnational Catholicism that would emerge in the 1930s and, especially, in the 1940s.

While French Catholics were skeptical of the state as such, Central European Catholics were more willing to countenance an authoritarian, Catholic state. There were multiple reasons for this: for one, Austrian Catholicism had developed as an ideology of state for decades, which French Catholicism had of course never done (also, as we'll see in Chapter 5, Austrian Catholicism would become an ideology of state, once again, in the 1930s). Perhaps more importantly, central Europe was in utter chaos in the early twentieth century, and it seemed clear that organic social groupings, particularly nations, were not going to harmoniously coexist without the steady hand of the state.

[1] Ernst Karl Winter, "Souveränität," in *Die Österreichische Aktion*, 143-62, here 156.

And while the most political strains of political Catholicism would collapse with Dollfuss and the *Anschluss* of 1938, a number of Catholics nourished in this tradition would become important to Cold War Catholicism as a transnational, and trans-Atlantic, project.

This difference in emphasis is apparent in the Central Europeans' preferred solution to the Rhineland question, which we've been using as a litmus test. The French, recall, wanted to dismantle "German-ness" in its entirety, seeing it and the nation-state it represented as heretical forms of modernity. They did not foresee a federalist solution to the Rhineland problem, if only because federalism seemed to them alien to the étatiste German genius. Central Europeans, however, drew on a different notion of the state, and a different notion of what it meant to be German. They wanted to reintegrate the Rhineland into a new German-speaking confederation, uniting it into a central European empire headquartered on Catholic Vienna (the Austrian Christian Socials, like many other Germans in Central Europe, claimed that Wilsonian principles of self-determination required *Anschluss*).[2] "The German-speaking area of Mitteleuropa," despaired one author in a Bavarian journal, "has ever since [Versailles] been divided into sixteen sovereign states."[3] This seemed like a tragedy to many central European Catholics, especially those in Bavaria and Austria (Czechs and Hungarians, for instance, were more enthused, as their nationalist dreams had finally come to fruition). "After the collapse of 1918," judged Josef Eberle, a key arbiter of Viennese cultural life, "the question of an organic arrangement of Mitteleuropa […] burns brighter than ever."[4]

---

[2] This vision took different forms, and was not necessarily linked with a Habsburg restoration. It was not, that is, an intellectual fantasy: Heinrich Mataja, Seipel's foreign minister, was committed to a form of *großdeutsch* nationalism (Alfred Suval, *The Anschluss Question in the Weimar Era* (Baltimore, 1974), esp. chapters 10-13). Mataja would go on, like Winter, Missong, and Kogon, to write for *Christliche Ständestaat*, one of Dollfuss's central organs, to be considered in Chapter 5.

[3] Joseh Räuscher, "Echtes und falsches Großdeutschtum," *Hochland* 21 (1924), 113-119, here 114.

[4] Joseph Eberle, "Die neue Wochenschrift *Schönere Zukunft,*" *Schönere Zukunft* 1, 1 (1 October 1925), 1-3, here 2.

Central Europeans were, of course, aware of the preferred French plan for the Rhineland. In one of Barrès's rare pieces of positive press in Germany, Heinrich Staab, a correspondent for the Bavarian *Allgemeine Rundschau,* wrote that he was perfectly right to argue that the Rhineland had no spiritual roots in the Prussian *Machtstaat* of the Second Reich. But the solution was not to annex the Rhineland to France, as the Rhineland was not spiritually French, either. This explains the catastrophic failure of French propaganda activities there, which the writer judges to have been as successful as "an elephant in a porcelain store." The Rhineland saga can only come to a close once the frame of reference is expanded: "We must not pose a question about the fate of the Rhineland itself. The Rhineland's fate and its spirit can only be posed by returning it to the collective German fate[.]"[5] The author's solution was included in his title, "Der Großdeutsche Gedanke": the journal's editor explained elsewhere that, in regards to the Rhineland problem, "salvation is to be found only in *großdeutschen* ideas."[6] For Staab, the vexing question of the Rhineland could only be solved if the region were folded back into a reorganized Germany, oriented not towards Berlin, but towards the Catholic regions of the South and West.

There was a strong commonality between central European and French Catholicism, geopolitically speaking: a tremendous hatred of Prussia and all that it stood for (this would become significant in the 1930s, as the equation of Prussia and Nazism allowed a baseline of cooperation for anti-Nazi Catholics in France and Austria). *Großdeutsch* Catholics rejected the Bismarckean solution to the puzzle of German organization. Richard von Kralik, the aged figurehead of Romantic, großdeutsch Catholicism, went so far as to equate this political faith with Catholicism:

---

[5] Heinrich Staab, "Der Großdeutsche Gedanke," *Allgemeine Rundschau* 9, 3 (21 January 1922), 26-7.

[6] Otto Kunze, "Großdeutsch und kleindeutsch," *Allgemeine Rundschau* 20, 39 (27 September 1923), 462-3, here 462.

"Großdeutsche thought is inextricably tied to Catholicism—indeed, they are the same thing."[7] Ignaz von Seipel gave it the imprimatur of a respected scholar, and politician on the make, in his *Nation und Staat* (1916). While the French blamed Bismarck's state for repeated humiliation and constant threat, Catholics in Mitteleuropa saw Bismarck's Prussia as directly responsible for the *kleindeutsch* (or, as they sometimes called it, *großpreußische*) Reich that had dissolved the more ancient unities of Catholic Germany. From his professorial post in Munich, Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster wrote at length about the total guilt of Germany, and particularly Prussia, for the war. Like others, Foerster argued that only a revived *großdeutsch* federalism could halt the Prussian menace.[8] The leading Catholic political party in Foerster's Bavaria made "Los von Berlin!" one of its electoral slogans.[9] Otto Kunze, a prominent Bavarian federalist, wrote a rare essay defending Bismarck: "as a Prussian," Kunze argued, Bismarck "understood better how to dignify the character of the other German states than would an abstract German doctrinaire." Even though the point of the essay was to show that Weimar was furiously centralizing even when compared to the Wilhelmine Reich—which, after all, had let Bavaria keep its monarch—the reader of one copy crossed out the conciliatory, "as [als] a Prussian" and replaced it with a more commonplace expression of Prussophobia: "although [obwohl] a Prussian."[10]

---

[7] Richard von Kralik, "Der großdeutsche Gedanke: Eine historische Übersicht", *Frankfurter Zeitgemäße Broschuren* (Hamm-Westfalen, 1921), 213-47, here 215. This series, incidentally, was edited by Hans Rost, one of the leading publicists at *Allgemeine Rundschau*. There are literally hundreds of articles from *Das Neue Reich, Schönere Zukunft,* or *Allgemeine Rundschau* that could be cited here; *großdeutsch* propaganda was central to their journalistic mission. For a solid overview, which unites all of the clichés, keywords, and paranoia of the movement, see Hans Pfeiffer, "Politische Fragen der reichsdeutschen Katholiken," *Schönere Zukunft* 3, 18 (29 January 1928), 373-4.

[8] For more on Foerster, see Gregory Munro, *Hitler's Bavarian Antagonist* (Lewiston, 2006).

[9] Allan Mitchell, *Revolution in Bavaria, 1918-19* (Princeton, 1965), 190.

[10] Otto Kunze, "Wofür kämpft Bayern?" *Allgemeine Rundschau* 20, 44/5 (6 November 1923), 521-3, here 522. This annotation is present on the copy in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, München. For a typical example of Austrian Prusso-phobia, see Ernst Karl Winter, "Das konservative und liberale Österreich: Würdigung und Kritik seiner Kultur," *op. cit.*

This hatred of Prussia was linked, in Vienna no less than in Paris, to a hatred of the nation-state project itself. While Central European Catholics were wont to envision an authoritarian, outwardly-Catholic state, they did not in any way desire a *nation*-state and its monopoly on sovereignty—the national principle had unraveled the glorious Austro-Hungarian empire, and could Großdeutsche thought was hampered not only by the selective application of Wilsonian principles, but by the nation-state form that continued to haunt the continent. This form as such would have to be reinvisioned if Catholics were to inhabit the "organic arrangement" they sought. The modern state, judged the Austrian Ernst Karl Winter, "is its own God, and is therefore estranged from all other Gods." So there is, for Winter, a close link—even an identification—between the modern concept of sovereignty and the disappearance of God. This led Winter to the apocalyptic phrasing in the epigraph to this chapter: sovereignty is more than a form of state order, it is the Antichrist himself.[11]

In this section, the Central European Catholic opposition to the Versailles order, and the nation-states that structured it, will be explored and contextualized. As in the previous section, we will begin by laying the scene, providing some background information about both Central European Catholicism and its political opponents, notably the Austrian Social Democrats [SPÖ] (those Catholics in Southern Germany were more concerned about the Weimar regime, which will be considered in the next section). We will then follow the career of Eugen Kogon, our second major protagonist, as a guide through the intellectual ferment of Central European Catholicism.

Whereas French Catholics had become accustomed to their monarchy's disappearance, Catholics here experienced it as a fresh blow, and one compounded by the political and economic turmoil of the early 1920s. Bavaria had, under Wilhelm, at least been allowed to keep its monarch, and as Werner Blessing has shown, nineteenth-century Bavarians had been socialized, through the

[11] Ernst Karl Winter, "Souveränität," 153, 155, 156.

press and the Church, to inhabit a mystical and pious Catholicism as their primary identity marker, looking to Rome instead of Berlin.[12] But the dynasty, along with much else that Bavarian Catholics held dear, was swept away in 1918 by Kurt Eisner and the short-lived Bavarian Soviet Republic. Although Eisner soon fell, many Bavarians remained skeptical of the regime that followed. Cardinal Michael von Faulhaber notoriously referred to Weimar as cursed with the "mark of Cain" (which led to a clash with the young Konrad Adenauer at the 1922 *Katholikentag* where Faulhaber made that remark).[13] The most powerful political movement in the region was the *Bayerische Volkspartei* [BVP], a spinoff from the renowned Catholic Center party (centered electorally and spiritually in the Rhineland). The BVP was founded as a rejection of the parliamentarist progressivism of Matthias Erzberger and other Zentrum leaders. While the national party was allied with Catholic labor unions, the Bavarian wing was dominated by Georg Heim's populist, and quasi-separatist, farmers' league. This was a Catholicism of the rural parish, and not of Munich, which inherited a bustling avant-garde scene from the Wilhelmine period, and represented an SPD-holdout in a sea of BVP voters.

Perhaps because Bavaria was the most Catholic *Land* in Germany, Catholics had not felt threatened in the Wilhelmine years and had spurned the tight organizational culture characteristic of Catholicism elsewhere in Germany.[14] The central organization in the Rhineland, to be discussed below, was the massive *Katholische Volksverein*, which had very few members in Bavaria. A dismayed Catholic jurist reported in 1927 that "[t]here still exist, particularly in Bavaria, some who are alarmed

---

[12] Werner K. Blessing, *Staat und Kirche in der Gesellschaft* (Göttingen, 1982). For a general overview of the state of Bavarian Catholicism, and its relation to political and economic upheaval, see Friedrich Mennekes, *Die Republik als Herausforderung* (Berlin, 1972), Part A, Chapter II. There is very little work on Weimar Catholic intellectual history; the classic account is Klaus Breuning, *Die Vision des Reiches* (Munich, 1969), Part I. The emphasis here, as is so common, is teleologically oriented towards Nazism: the section on Weimar is entitled "Preparatory Developments," while his primary purpose is to intervene in debates on the relationship between Catholicism and Nazism. For the attitude of Faulhaber and Pacelli towards Eisner's revolution, see Besier and Piombo, *The Holy See and Hitler's Germany*, 14-25.

[13] Michael Faulhaber, "Ansprache Sr. Emininz des hochwürdigsten Herrn Kardinals Michael v. Faulhaber," *Die Reden* (1923), 1-7, here 4; Hans-Peter Schwarz, *Konrad Adenauer*, Vol. I, trans. Louise Willmont (Providence, 1995), 163.

[14] Bavaria was roughly 70% Catholic in the Weimar period. Heinz Hürten, *Deutsche Katholiken, 1918-1945* (Paderborn, 1992), 559.

by the mere name, *Volksverein*."[15] Catholic trade unions, too, were far less important in Bavaria than in the Rhineland, due to a less industrialized economy and the blanket opposition of Catholic clergy and employers.[16] Even the BVP was less popular in Bavaria than the Center was elsewhere: around half of Catholics in the archdiocese of Munich-Freising voted for the BVP, compared to the three quarters of Catholics in Münster who voted for the Zentrum. This fluidity rendered Bavarian Catholicism particularly open to innovative political movements, especially on the right (including the Catholic and federalist *Bayern und Reich* movement[17]). The most notable of these was, of course, National Socialism, which drew many of its early supporters from Bavarian Catholics.[18]

The situation was similar in Austria, in some respects. Austrian Catholics, like those in Bavaria, had lost their beloved Catholic monarch and been thrust into an unwanted republic. They, too, looked askance at a socialist metropolis, bursting with American films and new fashions, situated in a bucolic and pious Catholic countryside. Although the Marxist menace in Bavaria had largely dissipated with Eisner, Austrian socialists maintained an iron grip on "Red Vienna," tirelessly seeking to undermine clerical influence. The Christian Social party was similar in structure to the BVP. Although the party had its roots in Karl Lueger's Viennese and ideologically vague organization, it had become more provincial and Catholic after Lueger's 1911 death, finding its strength more in agrarian regions and farmers' associations than in trade unions. Like its Bavarian counterpart, the Christian Socials found themselves participating in a Republic whose existence they, like most Austrians, deemed illegitimate; this led, as in Bavaria, to a Catholic political culture that

---

[15] Peter Tischleder, *Staatsgewalt und katholisches Gewissen* (Frankfurt, 1927), 6,

[16] Evans, *The Cross and the Ballot*, 209-216; Klaus Schönhoven, *Die Bayerische Volkspartei, 1924-32* (Düsseldorf, 1972), 23; Seefried, *Reich und Stände,* 121; William Patch, *Christian Trade Unions in the Weimar Republic* (New Haven, 1985), 16.

[17] Roy G. Koepp, *Conservative Radicals: The* Einwohnerwehr, Bund Bayern und Reich, *and the Limits of Paramilitary Politics in Bavaria, 1918-1928* (Ph.D. diss., University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 2010), Chapter 7.

[18] Derek Hastings, "How 'Catholic' Was the Early Nazi Movement? Religion, Race and Culture in Munich, 1919-24," *Central European History* 36, 3 (2003), 383-433, 391n for the electoral statistics.

bristled against the new political reality.[19] Austria was, however, more organized, as befitting a political Catholicism that was used to exercising power, and soon would again. Catholics in Austria were organized to the hilt, setting up an "unimaginably large number of clerical or Catholic organizations," as a leading historian of the Austrian church has written.[20]

Bavaria and Western Austria had longstanding economic and cultural ties and can, for our purposes at least, be explored jointly. This does not mean that I subscribe to a mythical notion of *Mitteleuropa*, or even to Karl Dietrich Erdmann's problematic assertion that Austrian history should be folded into German history. In the complex ethno-national mélange of central Europe, these major categories are more obfuscating than enlightening, and the historian must turn his focus to the region. The German Catholic heartland I'm calling Mitteleuropa extended from Bavaria to the Upper Austrian provinces of Vorarlberg, Tyrol, and Salzburg—regions that Georg Heim, founder of the BVP, felt should fuse with Bavaria, leaving Vienna in the cold.[21] Catholics here imagined themselves to be part of the same community, despite the fact that the Versailles Treaty, against the overwhelming wishes of the population, mandated against it. In the absence of political unity, these ties were organized in other ways, such as mountain clubs and shooting societies.[22] As Ludger Rape

---

[19] The key work on all of this is John Boyer, *Culture and Political Crisis in Vienna* (Chicago, 1995) (especially chapter 4 for information on the party's complex use of religion). Lueger's influence on Southern German Catholics is reported in Richard J. Evans, *The Coming of the Third Reich* (New York, 2003), 44.

[20] Erika Weinzierl, "Kirche und Politik," in *Österreich 1918-1938*, Band 1, ed. Weinzierl and Kurt Skalnik (Vienna, 1983), 437-496, here 446.

[21] For Heim, see Mitchell, *Revolution in Bavaria* 191. Some of these Catholic provinces, including Tyrol and Voralberg, were actually holding independent plebiscites and negotiating with foreign states (Anson Rabinbach, *The Crisis of Austrian Socialism* (Chicago, 1983), 22). For the Seipel-Kreis's affection for Salzburg over Vienna, see Klemens von Klemperer, *Ignaz Seipel* (Princeton, 1972), Chapter 2. For the regional turn in Central European historiography, see Celia Applegate, "A Europe of Regions: Reflections on the Historiography of Sub-National places in Modern Times," *AHR* 104 (1999), 157-82) ; John Boyer, "Some Reflections on the Problem of Austria, Germany, and Mitteleuropa," *Central European History*, 22 (1989): 301-15; William D. Bowman, "Regional History and the Austrian Nation," *Journal of Modern History* 67 (1995), 873-97.

[22] Tait Keller, *Eternal Mountains—Eternal Germany: The Alpine Association and the Ideology of Alpinism, 1909-39* (Ph.D. diss., Georgetown, 2006), chapter 4.

has demonstrated, there were also close ties, both financial and cultural, between the paramilitary movements that sprung up in each region (the Bavarian *Einwohnerwehr* and the Austrian *Heimwehr*).[23]

The Alpine Catholicism of Central Europe was headquarted in Salzburg, the staunchly Christian-Social city directly bordering Bavaria (indeed, it had been part of Bavaria only 120 years earlier, and Bavaria's deposed King Ludwig III fled to a castle in Salzburg in 1919). Franz Rehrl, Salzburg's governor throughout the 1920s, despised Vienna and its socialists, claiming that his city had more in common with Bavaria.[24] This form of *großdeutsch*, cosmopolitan Catholicism was on display, most memorably, at the Salzburg Festival, founded in 1922 with Rehrl's support. Bavarians made up a large contingent of the crowd in the early years, while the festival as a whole was dedicated to a renewed Catholic, German culture as an antidote to the secularizing tendencies of Berlin and Vienna.[25] The archbishop of Salzburg gave voice to this common cause at a 1922 address in Munich. "We are brothers," he declared to his Bavarian neighbors. "We share our ancestry, our language, our holy Catholic belief, even our emergency and our anguish. In truth and love, God be thanked, we are bound."[26]

There was a great deal of intellectual-cultural exchange, as well. Foerster, already mentioned, was symbolic here: although born in Berlin, he found his true home shuttling between Munich and

---

[23] Ludger Rape, *Österreichischen Heimwehren und die bayerische Rechte, 1920-1923* (Vienna, 1977). For a more recent version of this argument, which usefully brings the Hungarian paramilitary movements into this discussion, see Robert Gerwarth, "The Central European Counter-Revolution: Paramilitary Violence in Germany, Austria and Hungary after the Great War," *Past and Present* 200 (2008), 175-209.

[24] There were, however, many conservative intellectuals in Vienna. On conservatism there, see Janek Wasserman, *Black Vienna, Red Vienna: The Struggle for Intellectual and Political Hegemony in Interwar Vienna, 1918-1938* (Ph.D. diss., Washington University, 2010), Chapter 5.

[25] Michael Steinberg, *Austria as Theater and Ideology* (Ithaca, 1990), esp. pages 70-72. For another account of Salzburg and its special attraction for Austrian Catholics, see Judith Beniston, *Welttheater: Hofsmannsthal, Richard von Kralik, and the Revival of Catholic Drama in Austria, 1890-1934* (Lonon, 1998), esp. Chapter 7 (not all Catholic conservatives, she points out, were smitten by the Salzburg festival—some saw it as too commercial and smacking of Berlin-style hucksterism).

[26] Quoted Heinrich Lutz, *Demokratie im Zwielich* (Munich, 1963), 95.

Vienna, penning scathing critiques of Prussia alongside soaring hymns to the genius of Austria.[27] The leading Catholic journal in the whole region was *Schönere Zukunft*, headquartered in Vienna: one memoir of the period recalls that it was a common sight in monasteries, and in the hands of priests and bishops.[28] A prominent Rhenish Catholic, looking on in horror, claimed that this "Romanticism of a Christian universal culture, following the medieval model, is represented above all in Austria by the journal *Schönere Zukunft*."[29] Although published in Vienna, it advocated and performed a wider German identity. Its founder and editor, Josef Eberle, hailed from Southern Germany, as did many of his contributors, and his previous journal, *Das Neue Reich*, had been published in Tyrol. Eberle's journal was widely read throughout the former Habsburg empire and in Germany, where it actually had more readers than it did in Austria. The journal was interested in Bavarian issues: Eberle wrote a characteristic article called simply, "The Struggle between Bavaria and the Reich: For Munich, against Berlin."[30] The journal had a great deal in common, intellectualy and in terms of personnel, with Bavarian Catholicism's central journal: *Allgemeine Rundschau* (in fact, the two nearly merged in 1927). Many contributed from Austria, including Alfred Missong and Richard von Schaukal, two of Austria's premier conservatives (the former could be tracked through the dissertation: he eventually

---

[27] Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster, *Das österreichische Problem vom ethischen und staatspädagogischen Gesichtspunkt* (Vienna, 1914).

[28] Friedrich Muckermann, *Im Kampf Zwischen zwei Epochen* (Mainz, 1973), 476.

[29] Ernst Michel, *Politik aus dem Glauben* (Jena, 1926), 11.

[30] Joseph Eberle, "Der Kampf zwischen Bayern und Reich: Für München, gegen Berlin," *Das Neue Reich* 4, 45 (6 Aug 1922), 869-72. There is not a great deal of scholarship on Eberle, who for all his organizing prowess was not an interesting thinker. See "Joseph Eberle—Katholischer Publizist der Ersten Republik," *Alemannia Studens*, Bd. 3 (1993), 89-105; Anita Ziegerhofer-Prettenthaler, "Schönere Zukunft: Die führende Wochenschrift der (österreichischen) Ersten Republik (1925-38)," *Le Milieu Intellectuel Catholique en Allemagne, sa Presse et Ses Réseaux (1871-1963),* ed. Michel Grunewald and Uwe Punschner (Berne 2006), 395-414. His work was so influential in Bavaria that Friedhelm Mennekes, a historian of the Bavarian right wing, considers his earlier *Das Neue Reich* to be one of the most important journals to understand Bavarian conservatism. Mennekes, *Die Republik als Herausforderung* 14-15. Per Vanessa Conze, it had a circulation of about 20,000, two thirds of which went to Germany. Conze, *Das Europe der Deutschen* (Munich, 2005), 225.

edited the major organ of the triumphant Austrian Christian Democrats).[31] Dietrich von Hildebrand, who would go on to become one of Dollfuss's most prominent defenders in the 1930s, was associated with Bavarian legitimist movements in the 1920s and began his career writing for *Allgemeine Rundschau*.[32]

Eugen Kogon, the second major protagonist of the dissertation, was, like Hildebrand, a German who began his career writing for *Allgemeine Rundschau* before making a name for himself in Austria. Born in Munich in 1903, Kogon was educated by Dominicans, as his parents had died when he was young. After the war, he remained in the turbulent center of Munich, involving himself with Catholic youth groups and clashing with National Socialists in the *Hofbräuhaus*. He studied political economy there, working a second job to pay his way through school, before traveling to Florence in 1925 to study at the university and study the Fascist state firsthand. He then met his wife in South Tyrol and moved with her to Vienna, where he began his study with Othmar Spann and started writing journalistic articles on politics and economics.[33] Following the well-trodden path between these journals, he became an assistant editor of *Schönere Zukunft* in 1927 and a central figure in Austrian Catholic intellectual life. His mission, though, was German in the widest sense: "In the German *Ostmark*, in Austria," he reported in 1930, "we are experiencing the pangs of the rebirth of German political thought."[34]

---

[31] For an especially clear demonstration of the journal's Austro-philia, see Otto Hipp [Mayor of Regensburg], "Oesterreich und wir," *Allgemeine Rundschau* 24, 36 (4 Sept 24), 569-70

[32] For Hildebrand's relationship with Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster, see Alice von Hildebrand, *Soul of a Lion* (San Francisco, 2000), 162ff.

[33] Kogon, "Das wiedererwachende Asien," *Allgemeine Rundschau* 21, 30 (24 July 1924), 457-8. This is missing from the bibliography appended to Kogon's collected works.

[34] Quoted on Karl Prümm, *Walter Dirks und Eugen Kogon als katholische Publizisten der Weimarer Republik* (Heidelberg 1984), 63.

He remained a constant visitor to his birth country, and he wrote a clutch of articles for *Hochland*, the most prestigious cultural organ of German-speaking Catholicism as such. We have a contemporary account of him from Friedrich Fuchs, one of *Hochland*'s editors. "He is certainly a well-instructed man," Fuchs wrote to a friend in 1928. "He earns his bread with Eberle, to whom he claims to be very important. […] He speaks often and charmingly of Eberle (an amusing farmer, which is both his strength and his weakness)."[35] It seems that Kogon was not simply boasting about his importance: a French Catholic observer in 1933 described Kogon as "Eberle's right arm," and Kogon contributed an enormous amount to *Schönere Zukunft*.[36]

This, then, was the shape of Catholic political culture in Mitteleuropa, and the background of Eugen Kogon, our exemplary figure; we can now turn to its contents. The same question poses itself as in France, and it must be answered in the same contextual way. Why, precisely, were Catholics so opposed to the new order? There was, we'll see, no blanket "opposition to modernity." There was also very little principled monarchism, let alone invocations of divine right. Central European Catholicism, even moreso than French, was indifferent to royalism. Although there certainly were pockets of it, the restoration of the Wittelsbach or Habsburg dynasties was so unlikely, and they had anyway been so tarred by defeat, that few Catholics seriously supported it.[37] Nor were they, in any simple way, wed to authoritarian politics as a matter of course. To take one

---

[35] Fuchs to Muth, 14 April 1928, Nachlaß Muth, Ana390II.A, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München.

[36] A. Robinet de Clery, "Le catholicisme allemand et l'hitlérisme," *Credo* 93 (Aug-Sept 1933), 19-29, here 22. For an (incomplete) bibliography of Kogon's writing in this period, see the appendix to Eugen Kogon, *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. VIII (Berlin, 1996). Biographical details can be found in Kogon, *Dieses merkwürdige, wichtige Leben*, ed. Michael Kogon (Berlin, 1997), 29-36, and see 39 for a charitable reading of his own past.

[37] "Something in the old regime," Seipel wrote in 1918, "has caused the great misfortune in which we find ourselves, therefore the regime must disappear." Klemperer, *Ignaz Seipel* 105.

example: in his lengthy series of articles on Italian Fascism, which he had after all studied firsthand, Kogon criticized it for its étatisme and centralization.[38]

As in France, politics in Mitteleuropa were divided between Catholics and Socialists of one stripe or another (post-Eisner, revolutionary Bolshevism was off the table in Bavaria, and had always been far from the concerns of the Austro-Marxists). They had much in common with one another, and it was not writ in stone that they would become bitter enemies: indeed, in Austria in 1919 the Christian Socialists and Social Democrats in Austria entered a coalition. Both groups had taken the "social turn" in preceding decades, and wanted to replace the dessicated liberalism of the prewar period with a more robust and organized economy. Ignaz Seipel in 1919 drew upon this shared heritage, arguing that the Catholic tradition, too, provided the resources for socialization. As Seipel claimed and John Boyer has shown in more detail, Karl Lueger's party provided a model of municipal socialism and efficient government: "Red Vienna," in fact, in many ways drew upon its "black" predecessor.[39]

Intellectually, socialists and Catholics both sought to overturn the putative "atomism" of *Ringstrasse* liberalism and discover more communal forms of social-economic existence. Kogon and other Catholic sociologists shared, for instance, the Marxist worry over *"Hochkapitalismus"* and its individuating tendencies.[40] Catholics, no less than Marxists, refused to see the "individual" as the component part of society, and thought this category error was at the heart of capitalist decadence. "Without being in another," wrote a leading Austrian Catholic intellectual, "the human spirit cannot

---

[38] Kogon, "Wirtschaft und Diktatur: Das italienische Beispiel," *Hochland* 24 (1927), 385-406.

[39] John W. Boyer, *Political Radicalism in Late Imperial Vienna* (Chicago, 1981); Klemperer, *Ignaz Seipel* 123.

[40] For a classic account, see Carl Schorske, *Fin de siècle Vienna* (New York, 1981), chapter 2; for Kogon on *Hochkapitalismus*, see, among other places, Kogon, "Wirtschaft und Diktatur: Das italienische Beispiel," 392.

become a self any more […] than one can sail without wind."[41] Ignaz von Seipel, in fact, was teaching courses on Catholic sociology and economics at the University of Salzburg in the immediate prewar years.[42] As Klemens von Klemperer has pointed out, Catholics and Marxists were not even very far apart on the "nationalities question" that so dominated Central European politics at the time.[43] The Austro-Marxists and their Socialist party had more nuanced views than Bolsheviks or Spartacists on this question (raising Lenin's ire against them). Otto Bauer, most famously, believed that Marxists could not ignore questions of national character, and that nationalities should be allowed to develop fully in an international federation not unlike the Austro-Hungarian empire (the Soviet Union would come to embrace similar positions in its own multi-national empire).

These similarities, however, mask a more fundamental ideological disagreement. Similar political positions, in other words, can be built upon radically different premises. To take one poignant example: in Austria, both Marxists and Catholics were opposed to abortion. They both had natalist policies that undercut the individualism implicit in pro-abortion politics. But whereas a Catholic would argue that the fetus belongs to God, Julius Tandler, the socalists' leading expert on family issues, declared that the fetus belonged to that recently-discovered entity called "society."[44]

This language of the "social" united French Radicalism with Austro-Marxism: "Everyone speaks of socialization," observed Schumpeter in 1920.[45] Both were, after all, part of the broader, European attempt to square the circle between the new social sciences and older norms of scientific

---

[41] Quoted in Anthony Carty, "Alfred Verdross and Othmar Spann: German Romantic Nationalism, National Socialism and International Law," *European Journal of International Law* 6 (1995), 78-97, here 82n.

[42] Klemperer, *Ignaz Seipel* 44.

[43] Klemperer, *Ignaz Seipel* 62-4. Seipel actually quoted Renner in his work on the nationalities question, while his worth was enthusiastically reviewed in *Arbeiter-Zeitung*.

[44] Helmut Gruber, "Sexuality in 'Red Vienna': Socialist Party Conceptions and Programs and Working-Clas Life, 1920-1934," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 31 (1987), 37-68, here 42.

[45] Quoted Klemperer, *Ignaz Seipel* 122.

rationality. They were both, that is, caught up in the epochal shift between liberalism and sociology, and were trying to salvage the Enlightenment project after liberalism's collapse.[46] More specifically, they were both participants in the international revival of Kantianism in the early decades of the twentieth century: Max Adler sounds much like Durkheim in his invocation of the "social *a priori*."[47] In both places this Kantianism gave a strong role to the state as the purveyor and manager of scientific rationality against the entrenched superstitious of subsidiary groupings, like the family and the *Stand*.

"Municipal policy," Anson Rabinbach has judged, "was dedicated to the transformation of consciousness."[48] *Sozialisierung* was the SPÖ's name for its policy towards key industries. As Otto Bauer explained it, industry would be socialized, and not expropriated: labor, capital, consumers, and the state would jointly manage the newly-socialized industries.[49] And while the party had to scale back its ambitions after losing control of national governance, its policies within Vienna made it clear that they were on a crusade against the Church. The famous Linz Program of 1926 was quite clear that the party was dedicated to overcoming clerical influence via class struggle. Whereas the party was dedicated to socializing everything from childcare to swimming pools, religion had to remain a "private phenomenon" in order to combat the "condition of misery, ignorance, and servility" that marked the "religious intuitions of the masses."[50] Vienna became a laboratory for municipal socialism, in which the city government attempted to create a new working-class culture

---

[46] H. Stuart Hughes, *Consciousness and Society* (New York, 1958).

[47] For Adler and Kant, see Leszek Kolakowski, *Main Currents of Marxism*, one-volume edition, trans. P.S. Falla (New York, 2005), 563-72.

[48] Rabinbach, *The Crisis of Austrian Socialism* 28.

[49] Ibid. 24-5.

[50] Das Linzer Programm (3. November 1926), available online at www.marxists.org/deutsch/geschichte/oesterreich/spoe/1926/linzerprog.htm. Accessed June 2011.

to replace the atavistic Habsburg culture of prewar Vienna.[51] The workers were to be housed in municipal housing and socialized through SPÖ organizations. Directly upon winning the elections of 1919, the SPÖ attempted to reform marriage laws and abolish confessional schools, while the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* thundered that priests were the "electoral protection force [Wahlschutztruppen] of capital." In 1923, just as the *Cartel des gauches* was sharpening its claws in France, the Austrian socialists called on their followers to leave the Church—which 23,000 did in the next year alone.[52]

Socialists were not merely crusading against religion in general, but against the peculiarly political and Romantic forms that Catholicism had taken in central Europe. "Religion," declared Seipel in 1923, "must always be an object of political struggle for religious men."[53] Romantic Catholicism, so typical of the region, was more political in nature than French Thomism, obsessed as it was with the idea that the spirit of Christ should pervade every level of society, up to and including the state.[54] Thomism had made very few inroads in Mitteleuropa, while there was, a Viennese newspaper reported in 1923, a "resurrection of Romantic political thought."[55] French Catholics despised Romanticism—after all, French Romanticism had been dominated by republicans

---

[51] Helmut Gruber, "Sexuality in 'Red Vienna': Socialist Party Conceptions and Programs and Working-Clas Life, 1920-1934," 38. This mirrored the situation in Bavaria, at least until the BVP captured Munich's mayoralty in 1924. For analogous, if less extreme, phenomena in Munich, see Leif Jerram, *Germany's Other Modernity* (New York, 1988).

[52] Quoted Alfred Kostelecky, "Kirche und Staat," in *Kirche in Österreich 1918-1965*, ed. Ferdinand Klostermann et al., 201-17, here 204. For an overview of socialist culture in 1920s Vienna, see Helmut Gruber, *Red Vienna* (New York, 1991). For the socialist call and response, see Klemperer, *Ignaz Seipel* 229.

[53] Quoted Weinzierl, "Kirche und Politik," 437.

[54] Austria's greatest youth group was legitimist from the start. See Ludwig Reichhold, "Die christlich inspirierten Jugendorganisationen in Österreich," in *Geistiges Leben im Österreich der Ersten Republic* (Munich, 1986), 313-30, esp. 318-19. For the Church hierarchy's anti-capitalism, see Johannes Schaschin, "Kirche und soziale Frage," in *Kirche in Österreich*, 241-57.

[55] When Thomist figures or concepts were discussed at all, it was only in order to demonstrate their closeness to Romanticism, which would have made Maritain balk. See, for instance, Clemens Sartorius, "Die Religion der Romantik: Richtigstellungen gegenüber dem Modekampf gegen die Romantik," *Schönere Zukunft* 2, 31 (1 May 1927), 644-6. For the newspaper report, see J. Haag, "Othmar Spann and the Quest for a True State," in *Austrian History Yearbook* 12-13 (1976-7), 227-250, here 242. I should note that I am not discussing here the aesthetic, quasi-mystical Catholicism of Ludgwig Ficker, Theodor Haecker, and *Der Brenner*, which seems to me quite marginal.

like Hugo and Michelet.[56] "We must," Eberle implored in 1920, "create the spiritual atmosphere of Catholic Romanticism, as Bonald, Schlegel, de Maistre, Haller, Görres, and Adam Müller did one hundred years ago."[57] This was the task Eberle set for himself, and he succeeded admirably—to the extent that a German cardinal referred to Eberle as the "second Görres."[58]

The intellectual leader of neo-Romantic Catholicism was Kogon's mentor and academic adviser: Othmar Spann. Spann marshalled the insights of a generation of Austrian Catholic sociologists—Karl von Vogelsang, one of Lueger's tutors, foremost among them—and turned Catholic sociology into an intellectual and institutional force to be reckoned with. Although largely forgotten today on account of his eventual Naziphilia, Spann was one of the leading intellects of Central Europe. He was vastly prolific and influential in both the *Heimwehr* and in the academic politics of the First Republic, in addition to the *Kamaradenschaftsbund* of Sudeten Germans.[59] He was also a leader in sociology as such, insofar as Max Weber's methodological innovations, like his gentlemanly liberalism, were widely ignored at the time.[60] As Georg von Below, perhaps the fledgling discipline's most trenchant critic, argued in 1921, sociology had sundered any ties it once had to

---

[56] There were counter-revolutionary Romantics in France, too, notably Chateaubriand. But Romanticism overall was seen as mystical and suspiciously German. See, for instance, Deploige, *Le conflit de la morale et de la sociologie*, 174-180; Maritain, *Three Reformers*, 30 (declaring that Luther was the first Romantic); Maurras, *Romantisme et révolution*, throughout.

[57] Quoted on Karl Prümm*, Walter Dirks und Eugen Kogon als katholische Publizisten der Weimarer Republik*, 52.

[58] Fuchs to Muth, op. cit.

[59] John Lauridsen, *Nazism and the Radical Right in Austria*, trans. Michael Wolfe (Copenhagen, 1997), 189ff; Janek Wasserman empirically shows Spann's dominance of the Austrian university system through a comparison of Spann's success at placing students with that of Moritz Schlick. Wasserman, *Black Vienna-Red Vienna*, Chapter 3. For Spann in the Sudetenland, see John Haag, "'Knights of the Spirit': The Kamaradschaftsbund," *Journal of Contemporary History* 8 (1973), 133-53.

[60] Jerry Z. Muller, *The Other God that Failed* (Princeton, 1987); Peter Wagner, "Science of Society Lost: On the Failure to Establish Sociology in Europe during the 'Classical' Period," in *Discourses on Society: The Shaping of the Social Science Disciplines,* ed. Peter Wagner (Netherlands, 1991), 219-46; Gerd Schroeter, "Max Weber as Outsider: His Nominal Influence on German Sociology in the Twenties," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 16, 4 (2006), 317-32.

Comtean positivism, and had entered a period in which older, idealist forms of Romanticism were in the ascendant.[61]

Spann's project was to translate the Romantic social theory of his forebears into the combustible political context of postwar Central Europe.[62] He oversaw a public renaissance of Romantic icons, most notably his personal hero, Adam Müller, whose forgotten work Spann had stumbled upon in an antiquarian book shop. Jakob Baxa, another of his students, edited and commented upon Müller's work for a series of monographs Spann edited (Ernst Karl Winter judged "the Viennese school Othmar Spann—Jakob Baxa" to be "in the first line […] of research on political Romanticism"[63]). This caused a certain amount of desparation from Germans elwhere: both Carl Schmitt and Hannah Arendt despaired over the Müller renaissance. "Almost forgotten for a full century," Baxa happily declared in 1923, "[Adam Müller's] *Elemente der Staatskunst* can now celebrate its resurrection."[64]

---

[61] Georg von Below, "Zur Geschichte der deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft," *Historische Blätter* 1, 1-2 (1921), 1-30, 173-218, esp 15-26, 180-4.

[62] As a political project, the Christian Socials had already been trying to do this: the general-secretary of the Leo-Gesellschaft and author of one of the Christian Socials' first electoral manifestoes, Franz Martin Schindler, had been a discple of Vogelsang.

[63] E.K. Winter, "Romantik," *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Kirchengeschichte* 21 (1927), 81-102, here 81.

[64] For Spann's discovery of Müller, see J. Haag, "Othmar Spann and the Quest for a True State," 234. Carl Schmitt, *Political Romanticism*, trans. Guy Oakes (Cambridge, 1986), 21. Hannah Arendt, "Adam Müller—Renaissance?", in *Reflections on Literature and Culture*, ed. Susannah Gottlieb (Stanford, 2007), 38-45, here 43; Jakob Baxa, *Einführung in die romantische Staatswissenschaft,* 2nd ed. (Jena, 1931), 164; Jakob Baxa, *Adam Müllers Philosophie, Ästhetik und Staatswissenschaft* (Berlin, 1929); Paul Kluckholn, *Persönlichkeit und Gemeinschaft: Studien zur Staatsauffassung der deutschen Romantik* (Halle, 1925); Maria Schlüter-Hermkes, "Adam Müller (1779-1829)," *Jahrbuch des Verbandes der Vereine Katholischer Akademiker* (1924), 78-102; Alfred von Martin, "Das Wesen der romantischen Religiösität", *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* (Halle, 1924), 367-417; Ferdinand Reinkemeyer, *Adam Müllers ethische und philosophische Anschauungen im Lichte der Romantik* (Köln, 1926). A new edition of his writings was prepared in 1931 and presented as a forerunner to National Socialism: Adam Müller, *Vom Geiste der Gemeinschaft: Elemente der Staatskunst, Theorie des Geldes,* edited and introduced by Friedrich Bülow (Leipzig, 1931) (this was the collection that Arendt reviewed). The Müller phenomenon can be found in periodicals, too; for one example, see Alred Missong, "Adam Heinrich Müller," *Allgemeine Rundschau* 26, 2 (12 Jan 1929), 31-3. Although Müller was the most important figure of the Romantic revival, he was not alone: see, for instance, Otto Brandt, *August Wilhelm Schlegel* (Stuttgart 1919). For a discussion of all of this, see Christian E. Roques, « Radiographie de l'ennemi : Carl Schmitt et le romantisme politique », *Astérion*, Numéro 6, avril 2009, http://asterion.revues.org/document1487.html

Although the anti-étatiste emphasis of French Catholic thought was present in Central Europe, too, for a variety of contemporary and historical reasons the Austrians were more invested in authoritarian political solutions than the French. Unlike in France, Central European Catholicism had developed as an ideology-of-state: from the era of Metternich to that of Lueger, and onwards to Seipel and Dollfuss, Austrian Catholics were never far from the levers of power, which is reflected in their political Catholicism. Müller and Vogelsang theorized authoritarian state forms in the nineteenth century. "Christ did not die merely for men," Müller had famously written, "but also for states."[65] Spann, too, desired a powerful and authoritarian state, responding both to his intellectual forebears and to the utter collapse of public order and legitimacy in central Europe.

The state envisioned by Vogelsang, Spann, and the Christian Socials they inspired was powerful, but it was not a Leviathan, and it was not charged with administering the society or the economy. Spann referred to his state as a *Totalität*, but it certainly was not *totalitär*. Following the general trend of Catholic social thought, these Catholics sought to deprive the sphere of politics of its monopoly of violence and its abstraction from the living forces of the country. Legitimate and sovereign power was to be placed back in the hands of organic groupings like the family and the vocation (responding perhaps to the familial economy of power performed by the Habsburgs[66]). These communities were to have legitimate authority within their own sphere, which would serve as a limitation of the centralized state: Spann referred to this principle as *Sachsouveränität*, which is difficult to translate. Jan-Werner Müller has suggested "rational administration," while I would suggest something like "sovereignty of the object" to emphasize that the peculiar rationality of

---

[65] Quoted from *Die Elemente der Staatskunst* (1809), and used as the title of a series of readings from Müller in *Christliche Ständestaat*, for which see chapter 5. Adam Müller, "Daß Christus nicht bloß für die Menschen, sondern auch für die Staaten gestorben sei," *Christliche Ständestaat* 4, 42 (24 October 1937), 1065-7.

[66] Daniel Unowsky, *The Pomp and Politics of Patriotism* (West Lafayette, 2005).

Sachsouveränität comes from its location in the great chain of being.[67] "*Sachsouveränität*," Spann emphasized, "takes the place of *Volkssouveränität*," which was the sin of the republic (in Austria as in France).[68]

Although Spann was its intellectual progenitor, neo-Romanticism can best be traced in the work of Kogon, who was its ambassador to Germany, writing a blockbuster essay on Spann's thought in *Hochland*. Like Winter, who praised Kogon's work in *Allgemeine Rundschau*, Kogon felt that social breakdown was linked to the Leviathan of the nation-state. "The more atomized the society," Kogon writes, "the more powerful the central government."[69] Following the path blazed by Müller and Spann, both of whom were supremely interested in questions of finance, Kogon thought that money, and not democracy, was the solvent of the proper social order.[70] Like others in his milieu, he was convinced that the European crisis had more to do with economics than with politics, narrowly construed. "The 'Century of Technology'," Kogon suggests, "could also be called the 'Century of the Achievement of Market Domination' or the 'Century of Speculation.'"[71] These issues had particular resonance in Germany and Austria in these years, of course, and recent scholarship has

---

[67] Jan Werner-Müller, *Contesting Democracy* (New Haven, 2011), 183.

[68] Quoted Carty, "Alfred Verdross and Othmar Spann," 91.

[69] Eugen Kogon, *Die Idee des christlichen Ständestaats* (Berlin, 2000), 176; for Winter's praise of Kogon, see Ernst Karl Winter, "Die österreichische Aktion," *Allgemeine Rundschau* 26, 36 (7 Sept 1929), 685-90, here 685.

[70] Kogon's most important series of essays in the 1920s were about finance, including a voluminous series in *Schönere Zukunft* which was not reproduced in his collected writings. For more on this theme, see Jakob Baxa, *Einführung in die romantische Staatswissenschaft,* 184 *passim* (for a discussion of money and credit). For Eberle's interest in similar issues, see for instance, Josef Eberle, *Zertrümmert die Götzen! Zwölf Aufsätze über Liberalismus und Sozialdemokratie* (Wien, 1918). Several chapters are devoted to liberalism as the antithesis of Christianity. See also his programmatic article that opens *Schönere Zukunft:* Joseph Eberle, "Die neue Wochenschrift *Schönere Zukunft,*" *Schönere Zukunft* 1, 1 (1 October 1925), 1-3, especially 3. For Müller's theory of money, see See Richard T. Gray, "Hypermoney, Hypermarket: Adam Müller's Theory of Money and Romantic Semiotics," *New Literary History* 31, 2 (Spring 2000), 295-314.

[71] Eugen Kogon, "Spekulation und Spekulanten: Ein Gang durch die Wirtschaftsgeschichte," *Schönere Zukunft* 2, 43 (24 July 1927), 916-8, here 916. It should be noted that, although Kogon took this form of argumentation into some unseemly directions, this focus on money and exchange was not unique to him: Georg Simmel, for one, had made a similar argument in his *Philosophy of Money* (1907).

shown the cultural and political consequences of currency fluctuations.[72] Capitalism for Kogon is defined by the new prominence of money as the measure of all value: "an economy of universalized money, market, and wages." He tells a parable in which the devil tempts man to build himself a "prison of freedom," filled with ceaseless treadmills on which we run, soothed by the theologians and poets declaiming the justice of the system, "in order to manufacture money: money, money, again and again money."[73] No less than Bauer and the social democrats, Kogon sought a complete revolution in the economic and social structures of capitalist society, so that production could be oriented by social needs instead of profit.[74]

In this, Romantic Catholics were perfectly in the mainstream of the epochal shift from liberalism to sociology: in fact, insofar as Spann-style sociology dominated Weberean sociology in the 1920s, they were at the vanguard of this phenomenon. But, as in France, Catholics differed as to the identity of the social groups that should be relevant to modern societies. While French Radicals had emphasized "society" as the new organism, Austrian Social Democrats emphasized "society" and "class"—equally abhorrent to the Catholics. Spann, Kogon, and the other Romantics completely rejected this designation, and it was here that they parted ways with their fellow sociologists in Red Vienna.

For Kogon, the terms of socialist argumentation—class conflict—were already wrongly posed, because the notion of a "class" presumes a social order constructed in terms of "money" instead of nature. The very idea of a class violates what Kogon refers to as "the law of mediation and of small societies."[75] "What is often called a workers' estate," Vogelsang had argued, "is not an

---

[72] Bernd Widdig, *Culture and Inflation in Weimar Germany* (Berkeley, 2001); Martin Geyer, *Verkehrte Welt* (Göttingen, 1998).

[73] Kogon, *Die Idee des christlichen Ständestaats*, 158, 160.

[74] Ibid. 177

[75] Ibid. 176.

estate at all, but a proletarian precipitate which is the result of the decomposition of all the other estates."[76]

Instead, the solution can only be a reconceptualization of the nature of society and the economic subject, who cannot face the "market" as a "consumer," but must be imbricated in a dense network of relations—what Kogon calls an "organic totality of intelligent creatures [Lebwesen]." And in order to do this, the *agent* of the economic process has to be reconceptualized, from the class to the family, vocation, and corporation. There is a parallel here with the incipient personalism of Cochin and Maritain: as the French were seeking to save the individual from the monstrous state by socializing him into the person, the Romantics were attempting to save this same individual from the pitiless jaws of the market, by securing him in the safety of his natural communities. In his 1928 *Hochland* essay, Kogon defines society as "Organism—this means: a hierarchical order of living, proportionately self-acting, unequal members towards the fulfillment of a specific goal. Without classification and domination an organism is unthinkable."[77]

The most important of these groupings were the family and the corporation [*Stand*], a word/concept that was important for all of the Romantic Catholics, and would become only moreso under Dolffuß's *Ständestaat* regime.[78] The *Stand* was an attempt to make the turn to sociology while simultaneously avoiding the language of class and holding the Antichrist of state sovereignty at bay. Everyone at the time believed that individuals were conditioned by their place in the economic structure; Catholics simply did not define this positioning in terms of class. There are two callings that are fundamental to every society, Kogon held: that of the priest, and that of the father.

---

[76] Quoted Alfred Diamant*, Austrian Catholics and the First Republic* (Princeton, 1960), 61.

[77] Kogon, *Die Idee des christlichen Ständestaats,* 172.

[78] The word is difficult to translate, and "estate" is often used. I've chosen corporation, both in order to emphasize the links with French *corporatisme*, and because its contemporary English connotations seem closer to *Stand* than do those of "estate," which suggests something misleadingly class-based (either in the sense of Sieyès, or in the notion of an estate as a plot of land).

Interestingly, Kogon immediately dismisses the priest as a model for the social organism, insofar as his role is not to mediate between individuals, but between mankind and God. The role of the father, on the other hand, is to introduce the child into the hierarchy of communities that makes up a healthy society. There are many of these, of which the corporation is the first (the others are tribe, nation [*Volk*], state, race, and mankind). Kogon defines it this way: "A Corporation is the community of co-workers that is intrinsically connected to the *Gesamtgesellschaft* of other connections." It is thus one of many chains linking "the family and the state."[79] Note here that Kogon does not see the corporation as mediating between the individual and the state: the individual as such does not even figure into his analysis, as the individual lacks reality outside of, and only enters the purview of economist from within, the family.[80]

These theories were central to the region's Catholic political culture. "Society rests on three fundamental pillars: family, profession, settlement [Siedlung]," declared the 1923 Linzer Program of Austrian Catholic workers. The family is the strongest of these, while "[t]he corporations [*Berufsstände*] form the next higher community. Within their sphere, they should be granted an appropriate legislative, administrative, and judicial authority."[81] The program called for social insurance against sickness, unemployment, age, accidents, and more, but demanded that it be run by the *Berufstände*, while the State was charged merely with oversight. Likewise, the Heimwehr's Korneuburg Oath supported "the self-administration of the estates and a strong leadership of the state."[82]

---

[79] This definition on Ibid. 173; the role of the father explained on 174; "family and the state" on 175.

[80] This was a commonplace of Romantic metaphysics, present equally in Kogon, Spann, and Baxa.

[81] Karl Lugmayer, *Das Linzer Programm der christlichen Arbeiter Österreichs* (Wien, 1924), 8.

[82] Quoted in Jill Lewis, "Conservatives and Fascists in Austria, 1918-1934," in *Fascists and Conservatives*, ed. Martin Blinkhorn (London, 1990), 98-116, here 105.

These ideas were prominent in Bavaria, too. The BVP politician and Bavarian president, Gustav Ritter von Kahr, announced his desire to reinvigorate Bavaria's traditional *Stände*.[83] "True federalism does not know the concept of the sovereign state," wrote Otto Kunze, editor of *Allgemeine Rundschau*, in 1924. What federalism "knows, above all, is law," which is "independent of the state" and made from natural communities, stretched in a chain from the family to the state. "None of them are sovereign," Kunze concludes, "or all of them." He provides a particularly apposite example: "The family of a pair of Polish peasants without their papers, founded before a fearless priest, is just as legal and complete of a corporate body [Körperschaft] as the Republic of Prussia."[84]

Kunze's article brings us full circle: Kunze's analogy assures us that the Republic of Prussia is a legitimate body. Kunze explicitly does not, though, say that the Weimar Republic, or the Austrian one, was. Like other Catholics in Mitteleuropa, Kunze was a strict federalist, and believed that both of these republics usurped the legitimacy of the *Länder* and all of the subsidiary communities that made it up. All of this explains, in a roundabout way, why Central European Catholics believed that the "solution to the difficult problem [of the Rhineland] can only be found on *großdeutschem* and federalist grounds."[85] It was held throughout the region's Catholic political culture that the sovereign *Machtstaat* was itself at fault for Europe's decadence, and it was only by overcoming the very principle of national sovereignty, which the League was manifestly failing to do, that a just social order could be founded.

Again, though, what does this have to do with democracy? As for France, I have tried to tell the story of central European political Catholicism without using "democracy" as a unit of analysis.

---

[83] Koepp, *Conservative Radicals,* 122n.

[84] Kunze, "Föderalismus und souveräner Staat," *Allgemeine Rundschau* 21, 25 (19 June 1924), 369-70.

[85] B. Deerman, "Für das deutsche Rheinland!" *Allgemeine Rundschau* 21, 1 (3 January 1924), 3-5, here 4.

In this, I am following the evidence, as the Catholics themselves were not thinking in these terms. Neither, for that matter, were the Socialists: in both cases, ideological traditions existed that allowed the vexed issue of democracy to be solved by equating "true democracy" with some form of authoritarian government, whether it be a dictatorship of the proletariat or the prelate. Seipel himself declared in 1929 that "there can and will be no better way of life in which man may conduct and administer public affairs than democracy, the true, properly understood, democracy."[86] And while Spann, Eberle, and others on the far-right were reasonably clear that parliamentary democracy was unacceptable, they normally refrained from saying so explicitly, and anyhow the Christian Socials at the time were committed, in some sense, to the Austrian Republic.

The dispute between Socialists and Catholics in Central Europe was not about democracy, to which they both had ambiguous relationships. As in France, even the most reactionary Catholics followed the Leonine injunction to remain indifferent to political form, while explicitly holding out the possibility of an acceptable democracy. The Austrian hierarchy, by no means a bastion of progressivism, reiterated this Catholic commitment in January 1919. Even Josef Eberle and the *Allgemeine Rundschau* circle emphasized consistently that certain forms of democracy could be acceptable to the Catholic conscience.[87] Ignaz Seipel led the way here, serving for most of the 1920s as head of the Austrian state, while simultaneously criticizing that state for being a merely "formal democracy" instead of a "true democracy," which would recognize that the *demos* is naturally organized into groups and headed by elites (this sensibility survived into the 1930 Korneuburg oath of the Heimwehr). Kogon adopted the same language in an article entitled "Democracy of Today

---

[86] Klemperer, *Ignaz Seipel* 282-3.

[87] For the bishops' announcement, see Erika Weinzierl, "Kirche und Politik," 456. For Eberle's conditional support of democracy, see Josef Eberle, "Wie sollen wir Stellung nehmen?", *Das Neue Reich* 1, 6/7 (14 November 1918), 87-90 and Eberle, "Die neuen Staatsregierungen Mitteleuropas und ihr Rechtscharakter (Zur Kontroverse Domdekan Dr. Kiefl und Dr. Tischleder)," *Schönere Zukunft* 3, 35 (27 May 1928), 752-5; for an example from the *Allgemeine Rundschau* crowd, see Carl Oskar von Soden, "Der macchiavellistische Komplex: Zur Kritik unseres Staatsgedankens I," *Allgemeine Rundschau* 26, 35 (24 Aug 1929), 651-3.

and Tomorrow": the "formal democracy" of today must and would, he wagered, give way to the "corporatist [ständische] democracy" to come, which would not be based on the abstract and godless principles of 1789. "The democracy of tomorrow is no figment of our imagination," Kogon proclaimed. "It lives, and needs only further development and maintenance."[88] While this does not mean, in any way, that Catholics were great fans of parliamentary democracy, it *does* mean that the Christian Democracy of the 1940s, which almost all of the figures discussed here would support, could develop organically from the reactionary Catholicism of the 1920s.

[88] Kogon, *Die Idee des christlichen Ständestaats*, 148, 150.

Chapter 3: Rhineland: Waldemar Gurian and the Democratic Centuries to Come

In interwar Cologne, the contradictions and tensions of Germany were laid bare.
--Karl Anton Prinz Rohan, 1954[1]

In France and Austria, we have explored Catholic political cultures that were firmly opposed to democracy as it existed in the 1920s, for very similar reasons: in both cases, Catholics sought to revamp traditional *corps intermédiares* or *Stände* that would mediate between families, professions, regions, states, and beyond to Christendom itself. In both cases, Catholics drew on a similar nineteenth-century heritage of Catholic social thought, and similar negative experiences with unwanted and anti-clerical republics. These two *milieux* were, in many obvious ways, quite similar. But what of the third major Catholic *milieu* of the interwar period: the Rhineland itself? At first blush, it seems like the political culture here was quite different, insofar as the Catholic Rhineland was at the heart of Catholic democratic politics (the *Zentrum*) and of Catholic labor unions. And the Rhineland was, in many ways, unique. We should not forget, though, that Rhenish social thought was at the heart of Catholicism across Europe, just as it was (via Marx) at the heart of European socialism. The Rhineland, while abjuring the violence or political reaction of French and Central European Catholics, shared a basic sensibility with them: indifference to abstract questions of "democracy" coupled with intense interest in devolving sovereignty away from the nation-state and towards the *Stände*. At the same time, though, it pointed more clearly than any other form of Catholicism to the Christian Democracy of the future.

The point here is not to collapse the differences between these *milieux*, which after all did operate quite independently of one another and, sometimes, with mutual suspicion (this was particularly the case, as we'll see, between the Rhenish and Central European Catholics). Instead, we

[1] Karl Rohan, *Heimat Europa* (Köln, 1954), 164.

are trying to show that there were certain basic commonalities across Europe, while different regions had specific emphases that they would bring to the table when Catholicism became more transnational in the 1930s. Major differences remained about the nature of the proper political order: as events in the 1930s would show, French Catholics were deeply divided about the proper relation between politics and religion, while Central European Catholics largely believed in the necessity of a powerful, and Catholic, state. Catholics in Central Europe did not even understand the "individual" as a coherent unit of analysis, while the French provided an updated form of individualism through the new theory of "personalism." The French remained nationalist in the sense that their federalism would only take place within the French state, while the Central Europeans were already imagining forms of international federation to take the place of the Habsburg empire. And so on: this would all play out in the 1930s and 1940s, interacting with geopolitical events and crises to create a transnational formation of Cold War Catholicism after World War II.

Rhenish Catholics played an important role, too, especially insofar as they were forced to think harder about how, precisely, Catholics could live in an industrial, democratic, and religiously diverse world. "In Austria, Catholics can be conservative," observed Ernst Karl Winter in 1926. "In Germany, they must be, as it were, modern."[2] This is apparent in their own privileged solution to the status of their own *Land*, which we've been using as a litmus test: more than Catholics in France or Central Europe, Rhenish Catholics generally accepted the Versailles solution, and did not seek to radically dismantle the European order. There was very little support for Rhenish separatists among the population; most of it that existed had been drummed up by Poincaré, attempting to export his countrymen's enthusiasm for the scheme. Likewise, Rhenish Catholics, who lived in one of Europe's

[2] Ernst Karl Winter, "P. Heinrich Pesch, S.J. (1854-1926) im Rahmen der katholischen Soziologie," *Schönere Zukunft* 1, 33 (23 May 1926), 829-33, here 832. This did not apply, of course, to the reactionary farmers of Bavaria. In the article, which appeared in *Schönere Zukunft*, Winter was referring solely to figures from the Rhineland.

most industrial and prosperous regions, were loath to yoke their fate to the catastrophic economic and political situation of Bavaria and Austria.

While they, like other Germans, sought to revise the Versailles settlement, they did not want to demolish the Weimar experiment, as both French and Central European Catholics did. Most Catholics in the Rhineland, and certainly their political party, the *Zentrum*, wanted to remain integrated in the Second Reich—"Reich and Rhine, eternally united!" declared the anonymous foreword to a Rhenish essay on the subject, while the region's most prolific Catholic champion, Hermann Platz, was clear in 1919 that the region was a full player "within Germany's common destiny." Carl Schmitt's 1925 lecture on the Rhineland, too, assumed that it should be reincorporated into the *kleindeutsch* Reich.[3] Julius Bachem, the powerful editor of *Kölnische Volkszeitung*, went so far as to prepare a volume of historical essays on the fruitful ties between Prussia and the Rhineland.[4]

Rhenish Catholics were still wary of Prussia, but in a somewhat different key: they did not seek to disaggregate Prussia and the Rhineland, but rather to shift the Reich's center of gravity away from the jackboots of the East and towards the pacific traditions of the Catholic West. "The post-1870 German Empire," Scheler claimed, "has been far too strongly and one-sidedly centred in the Prussian spirit and still clings far too fondly to the old outlook of the absolute monarchy, provoking the inevitable reaction of hyperdemocratic opposition."[5] The saber-rattling Prussophobia of other European Catholics was, however, out of place here, and even Scheler sought only to correct the balance: the Rhineland was, of course, technically a part of Prussia. Their *Land* was only about 30%

---

[3] Carl Schmitt, *Die Rheinlande als Objekt internationaler Politik* (Köln, 1925), 2; Platz, "Um Rhein und Ehre," *Hochland* 17 (1919), 129-39, here 134.

[4] Julius Bachem, ed., *Zur Jahrhundertfeier der Vereinigung der Rheinlande mit Preußen* (Köln, 1915).

[5] Max Scheler, *Politisch-Pädagogische Schriften*, ed. Manfred Frings (München, 1982), 322

Catholic, while the Rhineland itself (not including the Saar) was almost 70% Catholic.[6] Hermann Platz, Ernst Michel, Max Scheler, and many other Rhenish Catholics constantly argued for a more Catholic *Reich*, which could simultaneously preserve the German genius without succumbing to Protestant materialism or the windy and atavistic Catholicism of Central Europe. The central organ for this kind of work was a new journal called *Reich- und Heimatblätter*, the journal of the Cologne-based *Reichs- und Heimatbund Deutsche Katholiken*, an organization founded for the sole purpose of diminishing Prussia's influence in the Reich.[7] "'Let us get rid of this Berlin'," a *Zentrum* politician recalled of this period, "was widely heard in the Rhineland."[8]

Rhenish Catholics were also generally appreciative of the League, perhaps because they were in the global crosshairs. Ernst Michel, a Catholic socialist in Frankfurt, rhapsodized that the Rhineland was a sacrificial victim in the service of a new, peaceful, and cosmopolitan European order.[9] This is most apparent in the careers of the region's two most characteristic politicians: Matthias Erzberger and Konrad Adenauer. Erzberger, who relied on the Rhineland and its laboring population for his power base within the party, was German Catholicism's most prominent champion of Geneva.[10] He was outspokenly left-leaning and democratic, which made him anathema

---

[6] Hürten, *Deutsche Katholiken, 1918-1945,* 559-60. This had led to conflict in the past, including such absurdities as Catholic soldiers being forced to attend Protestant church services. Jonathan Sperber, *Rhineland Radicals* (Princeton, 1991), 49.

[7] The founder was the Cologne professor and Zentrum politician, Benedikt Schmittmann, who had been forced to resign his position in the Zentrum's *Landesversammlung* because of irreconcilable disputes with the Prussian wing of the party. For an overview of his thoughts on Rhenish and German politics, see Schmittmann, *Preussen-Deutschland oder Deutsches Deutschland?* (Bonn 1920), esp 31ff. For biographical information: Hans Pfeiffer, "Der Märtyrer des Föderalismus Prof. Schmittmann," *Föderalistische Hefte* 1 (1948), 299-307, here 302-3.

[8] "Was wir erstreben," *Reich- und Heimatblätter* 1, 5/6 (1925), 38-9. George Shuster, "Conversations with Josef Joos," [reports of interviews between Shuster and Joos in June 1937], George Shuster Archives, CSHU Box 1, Folder 12, page 18, University of Notre Dame Archives, South Bend, Indiana.

[9] Ernst Michel, *Politik aus dem Glauben* (Jena, 1926), 144.

[10] Erzberger, *Völkerbund, der Weg zum Weltfrieden* (Berlin, 1918)

in the South (and to much of Germany, leading to his assassination). Erzberger passed the torch to Adenauer, who, as mayor of Cologne at the time, threw himself into international politics, hoping to make his beloved *Heimat* a bridge to European peace. "I am, as you know, a Rhinelander," Adenauer told an interviewer at *Die Zeit* in 1949, "and I have always felt my home province, the Rhineland, to be a bridge between France and Germany."[11] Both of them sought a solution to the Rhineland problem that would avoid *revanchiste* nationalism, be it French or German. Erzberger decried France's age-old desire to occupy the Rhineland, while Adenauer worked tirelessly, behind the scenes, to keep the region from falling into the hands of either Paris or Berlin.[12]

The specificities of Rhenish political culture were not lost on the Rhinelanders themselves, who were proud of their *Heimat*. With Hermann Platz leading the charge, Rhenish Catholics were obsessed with the special identity of their *Land* (as Celia Applegate has shown, there was no contradiction between longing for the *Heimat* and support for the Weimar Republic[13]). Carl Schmitt, for instance, embraced his identity as a Rhinelander in the 1920s, claiming that he felt a special connection to others who shared his heritage.[14] Rhenish pride was conditioned by a sense that Rhenish Catholicism provided answers to modern problems in ways that more reactionary German-speaking Catholicisms did not. The region's two leading social Catholics, Gustav Gundlach and Oswald von Nell-Breuning, "did not get along" with Josef Eberle and spurned his whole system of

---

[11] This interview accessed online at http://www.ena.lu/, June 2011.

[12] Erzberg, *Völkerbund* 34. While Adenauer's activities are murky and debated, it seems clear that was agitating, above all, for a Rhineland that would be separated from Prussia while remaining federated within the Reich. Klaus Epstein, "Adenauer and Rhenish Separatism," *The Review of Politics* 29 (1967), 536-45; Henning Köhler, *Adenauer und die rheinische republik* (Opladen, 1986).

[13] Celia Applegate, *A Nation of Provincials* (Berkeley, 1990), Chapters 5-6. Most historians, it bears pointing out, have ignored the fundamental differences between Rhenish and Central European Catholicism, primarily because the latter has been essentially ignored, especially in English-language literature. Derek Hastings's work provides a significant exception; for a nuanced German historian's take, see Reinhard Richter, *Nationales Denken im Katholizismus der Weimarer Republik* (Münster, 2000), 253-75.

[14] Carl Schmitt to Carl Muth, 15 November 1927, Nachlaß Muth (specifically referring to Hugo Ball).

thought.[15] Friedrich Dessauer, editor of *Rhein-Mainische Volkszeitung*, wrote a scathing letter to the editor of *Hochland* in 1921, complaining about Eberle's whole circle in Vienna, who ignored the social message of Christ in favor of anti-Semitism and kneejerk conservatism.[16] Schmitt refused to collaborate on a joint volume once he found that the despised Othmar Spann would be writing there, too.[17] Herbert Dankworth, probably the region's leading international affairs correspondent, warned that the Habsburg-style atavism of *Mitteleuropa* was pulling Europe back into chaos.[18] Anton Hilckman, another central Rhenish Catholic journalist, theorized a clear distinction between *Westeuropa* and *Mitteleuropa*. The former celebrated freedom, while the latter was tied to an atavistic "combination of 'Throne and Altar' (it is no coincidence that 'Throne' comes first!)".[19]

Rhenish Catholics had been at the forefront of Catholic innovation for decades, and had little sympathy for the reactionary impulses of their Southern neighbors (or their French ones, for that matter).[20] As Antonius Liedhegener has shown in his study of Münster and Bochum, this restless innovation continued in the Weimar years, as both cities registered church attendance rates around sixty percent.[21] The progenitor of all of this was Ketteler himself, who had been a bishop in

---

[15] Friedrich sMuckermann, *Im Kampf zwischen zwei Epochen*, 477.

[16] Friedrich Dessauer to Karl Muth, 21 November 1921, Nachlaß Muth.

[17] Carl Schmitt to Manfred Schröter, 6 August 1925, Nachlaß Carl Schmitt, Landesarchiv Nordrhein-Westfalen Hauptstaatsarchiv Düsseldorf, RSW 265 13590. The distaste was, incidentally, reciprocal: in 1931, Schmitt's friend Karl Rohan agitated to have Schmitt selected as Kelsen's replacement at the University of Vienna, but, as he reported to Schmitt, this effort was torpedoed by Spann's disciples. Karl Rohan to Carl Schmitt, 25 February 1931, RSW 265 11719, Nachlaß Schmitt.

[18] Herbert Dankworth, "Großdeutschland in Europa," *Rhein-Mainische Volkszeitung* 56, 45 (24 February 1926), 1.

[19] Anton Hilckman, "Europa: Versuch einer strukturellen Analyse der abendländischen Kultur," *Die Heilige Feuer* 15, 1 (October 1927), 1-10, here 5.

[20] Sperber, *Popular Catholicism in Nineteenth-Century Germany* remains the best account, although David Blackbourn, Helmut Walser Smith, and others have also contributed to our understanding of this phenomenon.

[21] Liedhegener, *Christentum und Urbanisierung.*

West Germany. His desire for a Catholicism that could make peace with the Reich, without submitting to it, lived on in the region. If anything, it became even more meliorative and capitalist in the decades after Ketteler's death. While he had drafted a plank of the Zentrum's platform calling for corporate representation, this was scotched by the 1890s, due largely to the opposition of the unions. By the era of Franz Hitze and Georg von Hertling, the *Zentrum* had, both theoretically and practically, signed onto a fundamentally *status quo*-form of welfarist capitalism.[22] This was conditioned by economic realities: while Catholic politics elsewhere were dominated by aristocrats, agrarian interests, and paramilitary organizations, the Rhineland was a region of workers, large-scale businessmen, and industry. Their political party was more progressive, as well. Rhenish Catholicism's relative openness to Protestantism and to parliamentarism was preconditioned by their unique political position, which made them one of Europe's few violators of the Westphalian principle, *cuius regio, eius religio* [whose realm, his religion]. Perhaps for this reason, the Center Party, a bastion of the Weimar Coalition, was primarily a Rhenish phenomenon. Most of the party's politicians hailed from the region, as did its leading newspaper (the *Kölnische Volkszeitung*). Wilhelm Marx, the Zentrum politician and two-time chancellor, was from Cologne and celebrated his Rhenish heritage. Adam Stegerwald, who led the Christian unions, came from Bavaria but had to move to the Rhineland to become politically effective.

The Zentrum was only one Catholic institution among many in the region: unlike in Bavaria, Rhenish Catholics were nestled from birth in a dizzying area of Catholic civil-society institutions. The most important of these was the *Volksverein für das katholische Deutschland*, Catholic Germany's most prominent civil society organization. It was founded in Mönchengladbach, just outside of Cologne, and remained headquartered there throughout the Wilhelmine and Weimar years. Rhenish

[22] Ralph Bowen, *German Theories of the Corporative State* (New York, 1947), 96 passim.

Catholics were about six times more likely to join than Bavarian Catholics, while Anton Orel, a leading Viennese Catholic sociologist, declared that the Volksverein was no better than liberalism.[23] He had a point, insofar as the *Volksverein* was largely dedicated to accommodating Catholics to the political and economic realities of Bismarck's Germany: "Mönchengladbach," Alfred Diamant has written, "became synonymous with the Catholic accomodation to capitalism and the modern state."[24]

Catholic labor unions, too, were more succesful in the Rhineland than elsewhere, if only because the region was far more industrially developed than Bavaria or Western Austria. Walter Dirks, one of the Catholic Rhineland's premier intellectuals, later recalled an upbringing surrounded by workers and labor activism, which would have been extremely unlikely anywhere else in Catholic Europe.[25] The first Catholic union in Germany, the *Gewerkverein christlicher Bergarbeiter Deutschlands,* was founded in the Ruhr in 1894, while the major umbrella group of Catholic unions, the *Gesamtverband der christlichen Gewerkschaften Deutschlands*, was headquartered in the Rhineland, along with most of its adherents. In the 1920s, these movements were joined by another set of Catholic lay institutions: the youth movements, made up of dynamic youths who sought to overcome the decadence of Weimar life through comradery and nature. These institutions swept German youth culture as a whole; within Catholicism, they seem to have made their biggest mark in Prussia (both Silesia and the Rhineland). The major organizations were Quickborn, which had been founded as a

---

[23] Thomas Matthias Bredohl, *Parshioners, Priests and Politicians: The Centre Party in the Rhineland, 1890-1914* (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1995); Hürten, *Deutsche Katholiken, 1918-1945,* 119-43; Helmut Walser Smith, *German Nationalism and Religious Conflict* (Princeton, 1995) throughout, and 110 for the statistics on *Volksvereine* membership by *Land*; Raymond Chien Sun, *Before the Enemy is Within Our Walls* (Boston, 1999). For an insightful account of workers' culture in the Rhineland, emphasizing its modernization and dynamism, see Lynn Abrams, *Workers' Culture in Imperial Germany* (New York, 1992). For Orel on the Volksverein, see Franz Josef Stegmann, *Geschichte der sozialen Ideen im deutschen Katholizismus* in *Geschichte der sozialen Ideen in Deutschland*, ed. Helga Grebing (München, 1969), 325-560, here 444.

[24] Diamant, *Austrian Catholics and the First Republic* 22.

[25] Dirks and Fabian, *Parallelen des Engagements* (Köln, 1984), 13.

temperance movement before becoming a full-fledged Catholic youth movement after the war, and Neudeutschland, founded in Cologne in 1919.[26]

Research into Rhenish Catholicism has become something of a cottage industry. The main reason is that it provides the most plausible predecessor of Christian Democracy, as the Zentrum was the only Catholic parliamentary party anywhere in Europe to have any significant success before 1945. Indeed, a powerful body of scholarship, represented primarily by Margaret Anderson and Noel Cary, has argued that a "Catholic Sonderweg" can be discerned here: Rhenish Catholics, these scholars argue, were more democratic, more accepting of difference, and more devoted to civil liberties than any other German milieu. Their attempts to carve a space for themselves within Prussia—a *Land* they could never hope to dominate—had made them "the era's true liberals."[27]

As in Italy, though, Rhenish Catholic political culture was riven by struggle and contradiction, which led many in the Zentrum, like their counterparts in the PPI and unlike their successors in the CDU, to support authoritarian solutions to parliamentary deadlock.[28] In actuality, the Zentrum was much less of a democratic party than the PPI. David Blackbourn refers to the party as "a characteristic political creature of imperial Germany." It was created as a pressure group for Catholic rights in the Bismarckean Reich, and never changed in character. As Helmut Walser Smith has conclusively shown, it was dedicated to its own unique version of Germany's future, retaining a combative stance towards Protestants and liberals: it was, that is, a *Weltanschauungspartei*

---

[26] The fullest account of the Catholic youth movements can be found in Richter, *Nationales Denken im Katholizismus der Weimarer Republik* (Münster, 2000), 176-207.

[27] Noel Cary, *The Path to Christian Democracy* (Cambridge, MA, 1996), 3, 4.

[28] The PPI and the Zentrum did have a great deal in common: Sturzo, for instance, wished to decentralize Italian power to the provinces and away from the "pantheistic, administrative and centralist state." Sturzo and de Gasperi actually paid a visit to Adenauer in 1921. Also like the Zentrum, the PPI turned out to be, despite its interest in agrarian reform, riven from within, as many of its members preferred to collaborate with Mussolini, who at least promised to protect the rights of the Church, than with the atheist socialists. John Molony, *The Emergence of Political Catholicism in Italy* (London, 1977).

amongst others. The party was unable to successfully, or even coherently, transition from empire to republic, as Karsten Ruppert has recently argued. Jürgen Elvert, too, has written that the party "never understood itself to be a decidedly republican party," while Thomas Knapp memorably depicted a party that was "*in* the republic but not *of* it."[29]

Cary focuses almost all of his attention on the early 1920s, when there was serious debate within the party as to the shape that it would eventually take. His hero is Adam Stegerwald, a Catholic unionist who made various attempts to forge an interdemoninational labor party. Cary's Stegerwald, though, bears little resemblance to the Stegerwald of other historians less interested in showing a democratic *Zentrum*: the Stegerwald of William Patch, for instance, groomed Heinrich Brüning, sought alliances with the DNVP, and sought an inchoate "German" democracy that would avoid the "formal democracy of French centralism."[30] Anyhow, Cary focuses too squarely on Stegerwald: the true leader of the party, almost entirely ignored by Cary, was Wilhelm Marx, who longed for the Wilhelmine empire and who looms, significantly, much larger in Ruppert's less sanguine view of the Weimar Zentrum. We could also look at the outcome of all of the intraparty debate: not Stegerwald, but Ludwig Kaas, an arch-reactionary priest, guided the party from the late 1920s until its dissolution under Hitler: a dissolution for which it was in part responsible, as it was the parliamentary force behind the Enabling Act. Even Joseph Wirth, erstwhile chancellor and left-

[29] David Blackbourn, *Class, Religion and Local Politics in Wilhelmine Germany* (New Haven, 1980), 231; Smith, *German Nationalism and Religious Conflict*; Karsten Ruppert, *Im Dienst vom Staat am Weimar* (Düsseldorf, 1992); Jürgen Elvert, "The Centre Party in Germany," in *Political Catholicism in Europe*, Vol. I, ed. Wolfram Kaiser and Helmut Wohnout (New York, 2004), 46-64, here 51; Thomas Knapp, "The German Center Party and the Reichsbanner", *International Review of Social History* 14 (1969), 159-179, here 162. Knapp's article demonstrates the estrangement between the Zentrum and the pro-republican *Reichsbanner*.

[30] William Patch, *Heinrich Brüning and the Dissolution of the Weimar Republic* (New York, 1998), 28.

Catholic, oversaw a shift away from cooperation and towards belligerent revanchisme in his tumultuous tenure.[31]

The biggest problem with Cary's account, as with many other accounts of the Weimar Zentrum, is that it ignores the region's political culture in favor of political elites and their makeshift responses to the avalanche of crises that rocked Germany in the mid-1920s. This makes the rightward shift seem like a contingent reaction to political events, such as the failure of the Reichstag to pass a school bill in 1927. While these surely mattered, they can also be overemphasized: it is inconceivable that the party could have veered, under different circumstances, towards Communism. In this section, I will turn the focus on the Rhineland itself, and not on its ministers in Berlin. What we will find is that, while there certainly were "progressive" forms of Catholicism at work there, it is far too simple to claim that Rhenish Catholics were democratic or republican. Like Catholics elsewhere, they were trying to imagine a "social Catholicism" as a response to socialism proper, dominant in Prussia; following the lead of the Vatican, and the example of Bishop von Ketteler, the founding saint of Rhenish Catholicism, they cared more about social form than political form. And, again like Catholics elsewhere although in a different key, they sought a social order that would leave room for traditional structures and Stände outside the purview of the nation-state.

As in the previous few chapters, and perhaps even moreso, it is necessary to dive into the region's specific, non-Catholic intellectual traditions to see how this worked. The major intellectual context for the development of Rhenish theories in the Wilhelmine period was the attack on laissez-faire, and the support for statist economic and social policies, current in Prussia. The *Kathedersozialisten*, notably Gustav Schmoller and Adolph Wagner, were important influences on the field of sociology as such, counting both Weber and Durkheim among their intellectual offspring;

[31] Heinrich Küppers, *Joseph Wirth* (Stuttgart, 1997).

moreover, as Dan Rodgers has shown, their particular brand of scientifically-astute social activism enjoyed influence across the Atlantic world.[32] They were among the first and most influential to reject *laissez-faire* economics by linking it to an outdated picture of man as abstract "atom." Their vision of progressive reform, like those of French Radicals and Austrian Socialists, was centered on the state and required the abolition or restructuring of traditional affective communities, notably the Church. Although most closely associated with the National Liberals, then in the process of tremendous innovations in public welfare and social insurance, their ideas were influential among Social Democrats, too, through the intermediary of the *Verein für Sozialpolitik* and younger figures like Werner Sombart (himself a socialist).

Catholics were not inexorably opposed to all of this. Indeed, as elsewhere, Rhenish Catholics shared many of the assumptions and influences of others who were taking the "social turn." Catholics, for instance, celebrated the refounding of the ancient University of Cologne in 1919, which had been spearheaded by Adenauer. And while the university certainly nourished a great deal of Catholic talent, its refounding had been supported by the SPD, as well, and it featured such non-Catholic luminaries as Paul Honigsheim, a founding father of German sociology.[33] This openness is inscribed in the very name of their reigning social theory: following Heinrich Pesch, Rhenish Catholics as disparate as Erzberger and Scheler supported "solidarism," which had been adapted from the Third Republic radicalism discussed in chapter 1.[34] Pesch, a Jesuit and the most influential Catholic sociologist in the region, had actually forged his ideas in the seminars of Schmoller and

---

[32] Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings*, Chapter 3.

[33] Ben Lieberman, in a comparative study of Weimar cities across the political spectrum, has shown how the SPD, DNVP, and Zentrum were, at the local level, essentially united behind a certain set of municipal policies, an expanded involvement of the state in public health, etc. (at least for the period between the inflation and the crash). Ben Lieberman, *From Recovery to Catastrophe* (New York, 1998). For an account of the University of Cologne during these years, see Willehad Paul Eckert, *Kleine Geschichte der Universität Köln* (Köln, 1961), Chapter 7.

[34] Steinar Stjernø, *Solidarism* (Cambridge, 2004), 208

Wagner: just as French Catholic social ideas came from Comte, Rhenish Catholic ones came, at least partially, from the *Kathedersozialisten* themselves. Pesch's followers, too, opened their minds to the non-Catholic world in ways that would have been anathema in Paris or Vienna. Heinrich Brauns, former head of the *Volksvereine* and disciple of Pesch, brought solidarism into the state during his eight-year tenure as Minister of Labor. Matthias Erzberger, too, was a close student of Pesch's theories.[35]

Max Scheler, a Catholic philosopher who held the chair in Sociology at the newly-founded University of Cologne, was at the epicenter of this attempted rapprochement. He had come to fame across Germany with his patriotic work during the war, which sold in immense numbers and made him a household name, even among Protestants. He was, moreover, a close friend and intellectual sparring partner of Werner Sombart and other non-Catholic icons. In a widely-discussed series of essays in *Hochland*, Scheler implored the rest of Catholic Germany to follow his example, as the noble German dream would fail if the Prussian version of Germanness were allowed to dominate the *Reich* to the detriment of the more noble and charitable traditions of the Catholic South and West. This would in no wise take the form of a return: like Pesch, whose economic theories Scheler adopted, he held that Catholicism must revitalize itself and make peace with the industrial, consumerist world of Weimar. Here, he argues that Maritain was *correct* to see "modernity" as a German invention, but wrong to think that there was any turning back:

> It is a tragedy to be forced to expel almost the whole world from paradise, even though we [Germans] didn't want it and were only following the law and fate of its own essence. And perhaps the heart of the mythical angel sobbed behind his iron visage when he showed Adam with his sword the new path of world history. But he obeyed his Lord and God, just as we obeyed the idea and the condition of the present world, the commandments of its hour and its necessity.

[35] Cary, *Path to Christian Democracy,* 79.

It would be nice, Scheler admits, to re-enter the lost Eden of spiritual plenitude, but that is not possible. We have been, fully and finally, expelled, and in order to fulfill our mission we must, like Adam himself, charge into the new world of labor and suffering, braving the evils of Cain in the knowledge that a Moses, too, could emerge from the crucible. Scheler referred elsewhere to the "democratic centuries to come": there could be, he reminded his reader, no other, as "aristocratic ages and monarchic forms of government," for good or ill, were gone and would not return.[36]

The question that has haunted these chapters emerges here, therefore, with special clarity: why did these Catholics, opposed like everyone to *Manchestertum* and atomization, reject full participation in the Weimar Republic? Why did Scheler become a political radical, while even more mainstream Catholics were loathe to shore up the republic's ruins (Wilhelm Marx and Ludwig Kaas are, again, the prime examples)? This was the Catholicism of Erzberger, yes, but it was also the Catholicism of Carl Schmitt, who was after all a full and characteristic player in Rhenish Catholicism in the early 1920s, publishing in *Kölnische Volkszeitung*. Why, finally, did the Rhineland's premier political party lack a serious commitment to the Republic, predisposing it to drive its coffin's final nail in 1933?

Scheler, who wanted above all for Catholics to re-enter Germany's national life, is in a way evidence of its failure to do so. In 1917, he wrote a revealing letter to Ernst Troeltsch, begging for help finding a post at a non-Catholic university. He wanted, he implored, to reach "the ear of *all* German youth, as I reject the rule of *Catholica non leguntur et audiuntur*." This rule—"one does not read or listen to Catholics"—had become a truism in non-Catholic Germany, and largely remained so in the 1920s, despite Scheler's best efforts.[37] Although celebrated throughout Germany following

[36] Scheler, *Politisch-Pädagogische Schriften*, 322; Max Scheler, *On the Eternal in Man*, trans. Bernard Noble (Hamden, Conn., 1972), 243.

[37] Scheler to Troeltsch, 6 July 1917, Nachlaß Scheler, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, München.

his 1928 death—Martin Heidegger referred to him as Weimar Germany's "greatest philosophical force"—he never quite extended his reach beyond the Catholic milieu. He finally achieved an appointment at the more ecumenical University of Frankfurt in 1928, but died before he could take it.

For an answer, we must turn, as always, to the political culture of Catholicism's opponents—to those who did follow and uphold the rule, *Catholica non leguntur*— and the hegemony here, as elsewhere, of the new and contested language of the "social." I will focus on the SPD, and not on the National Liberals: they were a party forged in *Kulturkampf*, and it was quite obvious that the Catholics would not find solace there.[38] The general secretary of the Zentrum's commercial and industrial advisory board directs us here when he declares that a major service of the Zentrum had been the "complete extirpation" of "the postwar phantom of socialization."[39] Although there was wide agreement about the need for organized responses to capitalist dislocation, the various parties of Weimar Germany disagreed radically about the shape that this response should take, and the extent to which the state should be involved. Catholics vigorously defended the sphere of charity, organized through the *Caritasverband*, and sought to place the family at the basis of any public welfare scheme. The SPD, like the SPÖ and the French Radials, sought to democratize public welfare by placing it in the hands of the state. This came to a head over the National Youth Welfare Law:

---

[38] The Liberals had split into two: the German People's Party, led by Stresemann, and the German Democratic Party, led by, among others, Friedrich Naumann. National Liberalism lacked the intellectual pedigree of French radicalism, but it nonetheless had its fair share of intellectuals, notably Max Weber and Naumann himself. These parties were united by a staunch Protestantism and opposition to backwards clericalism (this was especially true of Naumann); Stresemann, for all of his humanism, was always suspicious of Catholicism, while Naumann made his name with his 1915 *Mitteleuropa*: a clarion call for a crusading Protestant Reich.Jonathan Wright*, Gustav Stresemann: Weimar's Greatest Statesman* (New York, 2002), 59. For Catholic reactions to Naumann's work, see Goetz Briefs, "Mitteleuropa," *Hochland* 13, 2 (1916), 129-39, 385-97; Max Scheler, *Politisch-Pädogogische Schriften,* 396, 461.

[39] Quoted Eberhard Pies, "Sozialpolitik und Zentrum 1924-1928. Zu den Bedingungen sozialpolitischer Theorie und Praxis der Deutschen Zentrumpsartei in der Weimarer Republik," in *Industrielles System und politische Entwicklung in der Weimarer Republik* (Düsseldorf, 1974), 259-70, here 263.

originally designed to "create a public youth education and socialization system," the mobilization of confessional religious organizations, both Catholic and Protestant, assured that it turned into "a law which protected voluntary welfare against the expansive ambitions of public youth welfare officials."[40]

The Prussian social democrats of the 1920s, as a number of scholars have shown, were just as interested in creating a new *Wohnkultur*, and thrusting religion into the private sphere, as were their Austrian counterparts (the SPD program, at least until 1925, contained the same clause about religion as a *Privatsache* that could be found in the manifestoes of the SPÖ and French Radicals). After much *Sturm und Drang*, Weimar social democrats found themselves supporting the nation-state and seeing it as the vehicle towards a socialist future: "we are witnessing," declared one of them in 1921, "the gradual coming into being of the welfare state, of the 'social state.'"[41] The state, thanks to the 1922 Youth Welfare Law, the 1924 National Welfare Decree, and a raft of initiatives on the municipal level, found itself more involved in welfare—especially children's welfare—than ever before. The SPD was not afraid to take this reforming zeal into the Catholic Rhineland. In Frankfurt, for instance, the social democrat municipality brought in Ernst May to apply the principles of the new Atlantic progressivism; like city planners in Austria, May attempted to transform Frankfurt into a bastion of *Neue Sachlichkeit* and a modern, socialist culture. In Düsseldorf, Robert Lehr (DNVP) was obsessed with the municipal exhibitions that served as showcases for Weimar's social politics.[42] On the level of the *Land*, the new Minister of Culture in Prussia, a socialist named Adolf Hoffmann, embarked on an anticlerical campaign in the early days of Weimar. He

---

[40] Young-Sun Hong, *Welfare, Modernity, and the Weimar State, 1919-1933* (Princeton, 1998), 86.

[41] Quoted in David F. Crew, "A Social Republic? Social Democrats, Communists, and the Weimar Welfare State, 1919 to 1933" in *Between Reform and Revolution*, ed. David Barclay and Eric Weitz (New York, 1998), 223-49, here 224.

[42] John R. Mullin, "City Planning in Frankfurt, Germany, 1925-1932: A Study in Practical Utopianism," *Journal of Ubran History* 4 (1977), 3-28; Lieberman, *From Recovery to Catastrophe*, 31-3.

sought to end state subsidies to churches, abolish prayer in schools, and even ban Christmas celebrations: in short, he sought to create by fiat a socialist *Kultur* in a religious *Land*. Even though his more cautious successor reversed his policies, he created a firestorm of controversy and left Catholics wary of socialists, and of the Republic.[43]

To unpack the intellectual response to socialist provocation, we can turn to Waldemar Gurian, the dissertation's third and final protagonist, and trace his intellectual itinerary through the Weimar years. Gurian encapsulated the Rhineland so perfectly that this tour will, simultaneously, lay bare the intellectual landscape of the region itself. "It is a sign of a land's cultural power that it indelibly marks those, even guests, that grow up there," a friend wrote about Gurian in 1945. If Gurian "were asked to name the piece of the earth to which he owed the most, he could only answer: the Rhineland."[44] Note the grammar of this sentence: Gurian was shaped by the Rhineland like a piece of soft wax. Like Kogon, he was less an intellectual than a journalist and provocateur, with a gift for networking and for sniffing out the keenest intellects of the religion. He is useful because he gave voice to the "commonsense" understandings of his milieu's Catholicism; Schmitt was right when he judged Gurian to wield primarily "journalistic intelligence."[45] This might make him useless to the theologian, but it makes him supremely useful to the historian.

A Russian Jew born in 1902, Gurian's family had fled the Russian pogroms to Germany, where he was baptized in 1914.[46] He first became engaged with Rhenish Catholic culture through enthusiastic involvement with Quickborn, Catholic Germany's most dynamic *Jugendbewegung*. He

---

[43] Frank Gordon, "Protestantism and Socialism in the Weimar Republic," *German Studies Review* 11, 3 (1988), 423-446.

[44] Part of a biographical sketch (in German) that Thieme sent to Gurian; apparently it was destined for *Kölnische Rundschau*. Thieme to Gurian, January 1947, Folder 163/28, Nachlaß Thieme, Institut für Zeitgeschichte, München.

[45] Carl Schmitt to Karl Muth, 15 November 1927, Nachlaß Muth.

[46] The best biographical source for Gurian's life is Heinz Hürten's *Waldmar Gurian* (Mainz, 1972).

attended the Universities of Bonn and Cologne in the early 1920s, where he became involved with the youth movements and, through them, with the world of Rhenish Catholic journalism, in which he would live until forced into exile, yet again, in 1934. He wrote for nearly every significant Catholic organ in the region, notably including the aforementioned *Kölnische Volkszeitung*, where he served as an editor. He was an excitable young man with a knack for wrestling his way into the acquaintance of leading intellectuals: he was probably the only student to be shared by Max Scheler and Carl Schmitt, the two leading intellectuals of the region, and he was also the first German Catholic to befriend and popularize Jacques Maritain.

Intellectually, Gurian was formed by the specific variant of social Catholicism at work in the Rhineland, and Gurian's narrative follows that of social Catholicism in the Rhineland more broadly: a brief period of enchantment with socialism in the early 1920s, followed by furious anti-Marxism and traditionalist-corporatist Catholicism in the later 1920s. To see this, we will look primarily at Max Scheler, his teacher and mentor, and Theodor Brauer, a Catholic union leader that Gurian greatly admired as an expert on socialism Gurian's articles are studded with references to Brauer, Franz Müller, and other figures from the Königswinterer Kreis, a group of social Catholic intellectuals who provided the inspiration for *Quadragesimo Anno*, while Gurian's involvement with *Rhein-Mainische Volkszeitung* assured that he was in the mainstream of Rhenish social Catholicism.[47]

Both Scheler and Brauer referred to their social theory as *Solidarismus*, drawing on the work of the aforementioned Heinrich Pesch, whose shadow loomed large over the whole period. Born in Cologne in 1854, Pesch studied in Bonn before becoming a Jesuit and living abroad, where he confronted firsthand the ravages of industrialization in Lancashire. As a disciple of Ketteler and a student of Schmoller and Wagner, Pesch was able, more than any pre-war Catholic social theorist, to

[47] For one example, see Waldemar Gurian, "Der kapitalistische Unternehmer (Aus Anlaß der Schrift von Franz Müller)," *Die Heilige Feuer* 14, 6 (March 1927), 218-226.

grapple with both modern industry and modern sociology: the first volume of his magisterial *Lehrbuch* became common currency in German-Catholic institutions of higher learning, taking the place of prominence that Spann held in Austria.[48] Catholic philosophers (Max Scheler), social scientists (Goetz Briefs), union leaders (Theodor Brauer), and politicians (Matthias Erzberger) used his language and his theories. He was the major inspiration behind the Königswinterer Kreis, which included the giants of twentieth-century Catholic social thought, including Oswald von Nell-Breuning, a student of Pesch's and the major author of *Quadragesimo Anno* (to be considered in the next chapter). Königswinter is just south of Bonn, and Pesch's influence, at least in the 1920s, was restricted to the Rhineland, whose premier university in Cologne gave him an honorary degree soon before his 1926 death. The Königswinterer Kreis was, moreover, closely linked to the largely Rhenish *Volksverein*, and in 1932 formally associated itself with it.[49]

I won't dwell on Pesch's theories here, but will focus instead on their more proximate manifestations in the work of Scheler and his successor at the sociological chair in Cologne, the union leader Theodor Brauer. The central point, though, is that Pesch's solidarism, while sharing much with the anti-individualist corporatism of both Central Europe and France, gave more credence to the rights and value of the individual. While Pesch's creed that "all social functions can be found in the family, as buds and blooms can be found in the seed" sounds like Spann, he constanty emphasized that Solidarism did not abolish the individual, but rather put him or her into proper balance with the community. Indeed, Othmar Spann rejected Pesch and solidarism for precisely this reason, correctly pointing out that the principle of *Solidarität* could be found among

[48] Bowen, *German Theories of the Corporative State* 118.

[49] As the *Institut für Gesellschafts- und Wirtsschatsordnung an der Zentralstelle des Volkswereins.* Stegmann, *Geschichte der sozialen Ideen im deutschen Katholizismus,* 465. In his article on Pesch, Winter divided Pesch and his school explicitly from the neo-Romantic school of Austria. Ernst Karl Winter, "P. Heinrich Pesch, S.J. (1854-1926) im Rahmen der katholischen Soziologie." For the influence of Pesch on the Zentrum, see Karl Anton Schulte, "Das Zentrum und die neue Zeit", in *Nationale Arbeit, das Zentrum und sein Wirken in der deutschen Republik*, ed. Schulte (Berlin, 1929). 31-53, here 34.

liberals and socialists, and rejected proper Catholic universalism.[50] And there is no doubt that Pesch was, like his followers, more sanguine about market capitalism than the Romantics. He accepted economic competition as a *fait accompli*, and was, in certain moods, more interested in rejecting unregulated and rapacious competition than he was in overturning capitalism altogether. His goal, he claimed, was to give "a solidaristic foundation to Smith's industrial system," while the sympathetic bishop of Köln, in the *Kölner Richtlinien* that he oversaw, distinguished between "technical capitalism," which was acceptable, and the spirit of destructive and rapacious competition, which was not.[51]

In the early 1920s, though, Pesch's rigorously scholastic and traditionalist solidarism took a radical turn, as many Catholic intellectuals and journals turned towards a more full-blooded Christian socialism. Pesch led the way, writing a widely-remarked 1918 pamphlet called "Not Communist socialism, but Christian socialism!" Theodor Steinbüchel, a professor in Bonn, published his massive study, *Socialism as Ethical Ideal*, in 1921, in which he tried to salvage a properly Christian, ethical moment in Marxist socialism. One of his students was Walter Dirks, the Catholic who probably did more than any other to engage with Marx (studying Lukács and the young Marx). Dirks was, like Gurian, an editor at *Rhein-Mainische Volkszeitung*, the newspaper that represented the *Zentrum*'s left wing throughout the 1920s. Its founder, Friedrich Dessauer, was a wealthy industrialist who plowed his resources into supporting the Catholic left.[52] Dessauer made his views known when he founded the journal in 1923, claiming that he aspired towards the "creation of a great German

---

[50] Stegmann, *Geschichte der sozialen Ideen im deutschen Katholizismus,* 444.

[51] Kölner Richtlinien quoted on Ibid. 457; see 455ff for a discussion of this aspect of Pesch and his students. Pesch, *Lehrbuch der Nationalökonomie*, Volume 2 (Freiburg, 1925), 214.

[52] See Bruno Lowitsch, *Der Kreis um die Rhein-Mainische Volkszeitung* (Wiesbaden, 1980) for a partisan reading of the journal's history, or Blankenberg, *Politischer Katholizismus in Frankfurt am Main, 1918-1933* (Mainz, 1981), 108-25 for a less thorough but more scholarly account. For Dessauer's entry into the Zentrum, see Ibid. 37-46.

magazine business without dependence on capitalism."[53] He nourished a whole circle of left-Catholics, including Ernst Michel and Heinrich Mertens. Before his excommunication in 1926, Josef Wittig was the most prominent progressive priest in the movement. By the mid-1920s, Gurian held Wittig, who presided over his 1924 wedding, in even higher esteem than Scheler.[54] In a remarkable 1921 essay in *Hochland*, Wittig had made the case that the true Christian could be nothing less than a social revolutionary. "If Jesus can be brought together with the social question," Wittig asked, "why not also with the revolution?"[55]

Scheler, one of the most important of these Christian Socialists, was probably the most formative influence on Gurian during these years, as he was on Rhenish Catholicism more generally. Although he became gently critical later in the 1920s, as Scheler drifted away from the Church, Gurian's work throughout the Weimar era remains shot through with Scheler's themes. As late as 1928, a close friend referred to Gurian's "piety towards Scheler," while Gurian told an American interviewer after World War II that Scheler had been one of the most formative and lasting influences on his own thought. Gurian had encountered Scheler during his time with the Catholic youth movements, and his first book, based on a dissertation advised by Scheler, provides an interpretation of these movements from Scheler's perspective. It was, after all, through the youth movements that Gurian had encountered Scheler's work: "It must be well known to you," Gurian

[53] Lowitsch, *Der Kreis um die Rhein-Mainische Volkszeitung,* 6.

[54] Waldemar Gurian, "Wittigs Antimodernismus," in *Joseph Wittig,* ed. Ludwig Volk (Habelschwerdt, 1925), 90-101. This was essentially a reprint of Waldemar Gurian, "Joseph Wittig und Max Scheler: Ein Vergleich," *Germania* 496 (13 November 1924) (*Germania* was the Zentrum's Berlin organ). They also corresponded a great deal in the mid-1920s. Box 8, Folder 24, Waldemar Gurian Papers, Library of Congress.

[55] Josef Wittig, "Jesus, Soziale Frage und Christliche Revolution" *Hochland* 19, 1 (1921), 587-96, here 595.

wrote to his future mentor in 1921, "that your ideas find great favor among the members of the German youth movement."[56]

Born in 1872, Scheler was, like Gurian, Jewish. He was baptized in 1899, and spent the later Wilhelmine years studying in Berlin and Jena, where he became interested in Edmund Husserl and the new philosophical school of phenomenology. He rocketed to prominence during the war, on account of both his major work on ethics, printed in Husserl's *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung*, and his fire-breathing forays into the crowded field of nationalist propaganda. His *Der Genius des Krieges und der deutsche Krieg*, a sophisticated version of the standard *Kultur/Zivilisation* dichotomy, became a runaway success. He was, at the time, a believing Catholic and was hired, as we've seen, to the University of Cologne. Around 1923, in response to both intellectual unrest and a series of outrageous personal scandals, Scheler soured on the Church, but not before publishing a series of extremely influential works of Catholic sociology (a few years later, a young Polish priest named Karol Wojtyla would write his *Habilitationsschrift* on Scheler). "The development of German Catholicism after the war is, without Scheler, simply unthinkable," judged an obituary in a prominent German Catholic journal. "The name Scheler," the historian Thomas Keller has written more recently, "stands before all others for the modernization of German Catholicism."[57]

Writing at the peak of his influence and in Catholic Germany's premier journal, Scheler praised Pesch and added his voice to the chorus of Rhenish Christian socialists. Scheler called for a

---

[56] Gurian to Scheler, 5 September 1921, Nachlaß Scheler, Ana315.E.II. The letter ends with an invitation to participate more fully in the movement and lecture to a youth-movement congress. It's unclear whether or not this happened. Per his matriculation records at Universität Köln, Gurian took courses on Kant, metaphysics, and epistemology with Scheler, and another from his disciple Dietrich von Hildebrand (on the foundations of sociology, which we know from his other writings of the time were strongly rooted in Scheler's theory of value). See Box 18, Folder 4, Gurian Papers.

[57] Heinrich Getzeny, "Max Schelers Erbe," *Die Schildgenossen* 8, 6 (Nov-Dec 1928), 550-56, here 555; Thomas Keller, "Katholische Europakonzeptionen in den deutsch-französischen Beziehungen," in Hans Manfred Bock, et al., eds., *Entre Locarno et Vichy* (Paris, 1993), Vol. I, 219-39, here 224.

"prophetic socialism" that would avoid the materialism of Marxist socialism. In contrast to the universalism of Central Europe, Scheler's "Christian socialism" would protect the individual; he rejected the common, if paradoxical, Catholic equation of "socialism" with "individualism." The individual—in Scheler's parlance, the "person"—does have moral value on his own, and not *only* in community, as Spann believed. But of course, Scheler was not an "individualist" either. He believed, as did many Catholics in the Rhineland, that there was a space between, or above, the futile dichotomy of atheist socialism and "Romantic, reactionary-feudal socialism" (which he also castigated as "utopia in reverse": as good a name for Kogon's system as any). This third way was the "classic Christian theory of the corporation, as it was first formulated by the Fathers." Like Catholics elsewhere, Scheler wanted to "transform the working *class* into an *estate* [Stand]." This would take place in the context of a federalized and de-Prussified German state: "It is," he wrote, "in the constitution of the federal State that the Christian idea of community is most present today." Unlike both Marx and the reactionary corporatists of central Europe, Scheler ended by reminding the reader that the freedom of the individual remained paramount: Christian socialism was not a rejection of individualism, but its fulfillment[58] (like Maritain, Scheler referred to this fulfilled individual as the "Person").

The *Zentrum* did not, of course, adopt "Christian socialism"; as the 1920s wore on, it became clear that no such thing was in the political cards, and the socialist-Catholic *rapprochement* that Stegerwald and others desired succumbed to the stresses of 1920s politics. Here we can turn to Theodor Brauer, Scheler's successor in the Chair of Sociology at the University of Cologne and

[58] Max Scheler, "Prophetischer oder marxistischer Sozialismus," *Hochland* 17, 1 (1919-20), 71-84, here page 76; the quotation about the working class comes from Scheler, *On the Eternal in Man*, 399; the quotation about the federal state from Ibid. 386. Scheler's Catholicity has always been at issue; after leaving the Church, former disciples lined up to criticize his thought's fundamental atheism, while later Catholic historians have done the same (see, for instance, Felix Dirsch, *Solidarismus und Sozialethik* (Münster, 2006), 410-16).

another major influence on Waldemar Gurian. Brauer was, in the 1920s, among the most prominent of Catholic economists—when Martin Spahn wanted to publish a volume on "Catholic Germans and Their Fatherland" during the war, he suggested that Brauer write the section on the economy.[59] Born in Cleve, near the Dutch border, in 1880, Brauer found his way into social Catholicism from within the town's grain industry. He quickly moved up the ranks, becoming assistant director of the *Volksverein* in 1907 and editor of *Deutsche Arbeit*, the trade unionist journal, from 1912. He later served as Adam Stegerwald's private secretary during his tenure as Minister of Public Welfare in Prussia before becoming a professor of economics in Karlsruhe in 1923. Five years later, he accepted Scheler's old chair at the University of Cologne, becoming co-director of the Municipal Institute for Research in the Social Sciences simultaneously. Historians agree that he was the premier theorist of the Catholic labor unions in Weimar Germany.[60] For our purposes, he is significant because, more than any other figure in the Rhineland, he theorized the Catholic rejection of socialism. He gave a speech about this in 1920 that, in Noel Cary's eyes, shut down the burgeoning Catholic-socialist rapprochement, while his 1928 volume on German socialism was the first major account of the tradition from a Catholic—and it was not a positive one. Gurian claimed that Brauer's was the first decent book on the subject to come out of German Catholicism, and pleaded for the Zentrum to adopt Brauer's economic policies.[61]

The key move that Brauer makes, which both Scheler and Pesch had avoided, was the equation of socialism with Marxism: for Brauer, as for many in the Zentrum and in the hierarchy, no

---

[59] Martin Spahn to Karl Muth, 2 August 1915, Nachlaß Muth.

[60] This judgment in Cary, *The Path to Christian Democracy* 74; Patch, *Christian Trade Unions in the Weimar Republic* 57; Stegmann, *Geschichte der sozialen Ideen im deutschen Katholizismus,* 446. Biographical information from Franz Müller, "Theodor Brauer," in *Catholic Authors,* ed. Matthew Hoehn (Newark, 1952), 43-5. Müller was a fellow social Catholic active in Weimar, and he did Brauer the service of papering over his later National Socialist fellow-traveling.

[61] Waldemar Gurian, "Der moderne deutsche Sozialismus," *Die Heilige Feuer* 16, 7 (April 1929), 304-9.

compromise, even rhetorical, could be broached between the two traditions. And while Gurian may have been skeptical about this in the early 1920s, by the end of the decade he had come firmly to Brauer's side. Like his master, Pesch, Brauer tended to avoid the language of "capitalism vs. socialism" altogether, holding instead that a reformed industrial capitalism, cleansed of the language of class consciousness, could secure economic justice. Indeed, what is most striking in Brauer's work is how close he sounds to hegemonic traditions of *Volkswirtschaft*, debating figures like Werner Sombart and the *Kathedersozialisten* on their own turf. In his major work, *The Unions and Political Economy* (1912, new edition 1922), Brauer had attempted to theorize a space for unions using the language of political economy and national efficiency, deliberately downplaying class consciousness or electoral action to change the economic order. The unions, Brauer held, had a natural and important part to play in the national economy, and were essential to the pursuit of economic growth and efficiency.

Brauer's idea of the unions, though, was quite different from the socialists', a fact he introduces by dismissing Sombart's personal attempt, in 1906, to introduce class struggle into the vocabulary of the federated Christian unions. Like Pesch, and Kogon for that matter, Brauer believed that class-based organizations were bound to fail, running as they do against the grain of the natural economic order, which is organized around the *Beruf*. "The core of Berufsgedankens," Brauer writes, "is the belief that man performs a function in the service of a community, however constituted."[62] The core of the union movement, in Brauer's eyes, was the organization of workers by profession so that they could have a voice in wage negotiations, ensuring that national efficiency and growth would be compatible with economic justice.

[62] Theodor Brauer, *Gewerkschaft und Volkswirtschaft* (Jena, 1922), 27.

Sometimes, Brauer would come out rhetorically against capitalism, claiming in 1920 that Christians could overcome it through "the reconnection [Wiederknüpfung] of ties that capitalism has loosened, if not destroyed."[63] But this "reconnection" had, as in Pesch, more to do with the protection of private property and employers' rights than through their undoing. To this end, the workers had to give up their *class* identity and become a workers' *estate* [Arbeiterstand]. In a 1924 volume on the crisis of the unions, he claimed that the unions had "been pushed away from their organic development" and in a socialist, "anti-ständisch" direction. The labor movement, Brauer proclaimed, is "no movement of class struggle." Marxist socialism attements to "denude the worker of his fundamental unity, which is destined to every man, as *Persönlichkeit*, from his profession [Beruf]."[64]

Gurian, therefore, tracks the fundamental trend in Rhenish Catholic political culture: the shift from the revolutionary Catholic socialism of Scheler and the late Pesch, towards the corporatist capitalism of Theodor Brauer. More than his counterparts in France or Central Europe, Brauer theorized an *industrial* Catholicism, directed towards national efficiency and productivity. As elsewhere, though, we should ask ourselves what this has to do with democracy. The answer is more complex than elsewhere in Europe, as Scheler and Brauer were actively supporting forms of democratic politics. But in the end, we see a quite similar phenomenon: theoretical indifference to political form with an actual, empirical tendency to support authoritarianism. Indeed, just as Austrian Catholics were becoming increasingly drawn towards paramilitary politics in the late 1920s, and French Catholics towards the para-fascist *Ligues* in the 1930s, Rhenish Catholics oversaw a sharp

[63] Quoted Richter, *Nationales Denken im Katholizismus der Weimarer Republik*, 118.

[64] Theodor Brauer, *Krisis der Gewerkschaften* (Jena, 1924), 8, 16, 18, 19.

right turn in *Zentrum* politics in the late 1920s. Theodor Brauer is himself evidence of this: in 1933, like a number of other Rhenish Catholics, he threw himself behind National Socialism.[65]

Thinkers in the Rhineland were more interested in political theory than their coreligionists elsewhere: interestingly, though, we do not find a principled defense of democracy as such, but rather a more insistent emphasis on the Leonine notion that Catholicism is compatible with all political forms. In any case, Rhenish Catholics, like those elsewhere, did not think that the state should matter very much at all. Many in the Rhineland agitated against what Ernst Michel called "the Leviathan-nature of the modern, omnipotent state."[66] Heinrich Scharp, the chief editor of *Rhein-Mainische Volkszeitung*, declared, "The autonomous, national power-state [Machtstaat] […] has conclusively become untenable in Europe."[67] Hermann Platz provides the best example here, as he was the greatest proponent of the Rhineland's special genius, and also the founding father of *Abendland* (the journal), in 1925. The Rhineland, for Platz, represents the heart of the Christian West, as it had existed in the Carolingian period. In the proper Christian order, states remain independent but also leavened by a shared, Roman-Christian culture; political borders become unimportant in a Christendom of shared spiritual values. Nationalism, and the rise of the Machiavellian state, caused this order to crumble; moreover, "[t]he Rhineland is at the heart of this distortion and tension."[68] Only a chastening of the state, a necessary precursor to the return of religion, can solve the crisis: "Now is the time to move backwards and say to the state that alongside and above it are things that are not stamped by its own measures and laws, and which it must serve."[69]

---

[65] Theodor Brauer, *Der Katholik im neuen Reich* (München, 1933)

[66] Ernst Michel, *Politik aus dem Glauben*, 124.

[67] Heinrich Scharp, "Europa als politische Aufgabe," *Die Heilige Feuer* 13, 6 (March 1926), 209-15, here 209.

[68] Platz, *Deutschland-Frankreich und die Idee des Abendlandes*, 7.

[69] Ibid. 29.

There was a key difference between Rhenish figures and those in France and Central Europe: Platz, Michel, Scheler, Brauer, Gurian, and more believed, at least in the early 1920s, that this anti-étatiste, corporatist social order could quite conceivably take place within the parameters of parliamentary democracy. There was a general sensibility throughout the region that democracy could be salvaged if it could be federalized: Hermann Platz, a lifelong Francophile, was far more interested in the Christian Democracy of Marc Sangnier, marginal as it might have been, than in the Action française.[70] The increasing and dangerous power of the central government, Heinrich Brauns reminded Zentrum voters in a 1924 pamphlet, is a contingent affair and "does not belong to the epitome of democracy."[71] Benedikt Schmittman, the standard-bearer for Rhenish anti-Prussianism, did not question the principle of parliamentary supremacy, either.

Heinrich Pesch, as so often, led the way. In his influential *Lehrbuch*, Pesch approvingly quoted the Zentrum politician Georg von Hertling's dictum that "Christian politics is neither monarchic nor democratic, because it can be both."[72] Scheler, as we have seen, took it for granted that "the centuries to come" would be democratic, while Karl Neundörfer, a Catholic jurist and leader of the *Caritas* movement, emphasized that the Church could not tie itself to any political form at all (in one article for *Schildgenossen*, he directed his ire squarely against Adam Müller and the Romantic Revival).[73] "Men can choose any political form that they wish," Oswald von Nell-

---

[70] For one example of many, see Hermann Platz, "Die französischen Katholiken und der Völkerbund," *Abendland* 1, 8 (1 May 1926), 241-3.

[71] Heinrich Brauns, *Zentrumsarbeit am Wiederaufbau Deutschlands* (Osnabrück, 1924), 18.

[72] Heinrich Pesch, *Lehrbuch der Nationalökonomie,* Bd. 1 (Freiburg, 1905), 358.

[73] Karl Neundörfer, "Politische Form und religiöser Glaube: Eine Bücherbescprechung," *Die Schildgenossen* 5, 4 (July 1925), 323-31. See also Josef Mausbach, *Christliche Staatsordnung und Staatsgesinnung* (Mönchengldbach, 1922); Josef Joos, *Die politische Ideenwelt des Zentrums* (Karlsruhe, 1928). This is covered best in Karsten Ruppert, "Die Deutsche Zentrumspartie in der Mitverantwortung für die Weimarer Republik: Selbstverständnis und politische Leitideen einer konfessionellen Mittelpartei," in *Die Minderheit als Mitte*, ed. Winfried Becker (Paderborn, 1986), 71-88.

Breuning pointed out a few years later, "even the democratic one." (he was directly critiquing Othmar Spann in this 1932 essay)[74]

An interesting figure in this regard is Peter Tischleder, another Rhenish Catholic and contributor to *Rhein-Mainische Volkszeitung*. As Gurian wrote to Maritain in 1927, Tischleder's works "are extraordinarily representative of the Zentrum's political philosophy."[75] His basic project, as outlined in a number of works in the 1920s, was to defend the legitimacy of the Weimar Republic in scholastic terms. Catholics, Tischleder argued, are perfectly free to support any state-form that they please, and the notion that God enjoins a particular political form is both antiquated and false. In his 1926 volume called, simply, *Der Staat*, Tischleder sketched a Catholic political philosophy organized around a "rejection of the centralized power-state, which chokes the free personality through political paternalism, as was the case with the absolute state of the *ancien régime*."[76] Here Tischleder blames the monarchist state of the past for precisely that centralized power that Catholic Romantics elsewhere were finding in democracy. As this suggests, Tischleder was resolutely opposed to monarchical, legitimist Romanticism, and engaged in a running series of polemics with Central European Romantics, including Eberle himself. While Tischleder primarily drew upon the authority of Aquinas, he drew upon another fellow Rhinelander in his war against Romanticism: Carl Schmitt.[77]

---

[74] Quoted Stegmann, *Geschichte der sozialen Ideen im deutschen Katholizismus,* 446.

[75] Waldemar Gurian to Jacques Maritain, 24 September 1927, Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim. On him, see Peter Walter, "Ein Mainzer Theologe über das Verhältnis von Kirche und Staat in schwieriger Zeit: Peter Tischleder (1891-1947)," in *Weg und Weite*, op. cit., 327-41. Incidentally, as Walter describes on 334-5, Tischleder's major critics were either Bavarian (Franz Xaver Kiefl) or writing for *Schönere Zukunft* (Joseph Engert). He was a constant presence, as either authority or author, in the Rhineland's central journals. See, for instance, F.E., "Thomas von Aquin: Vom Staate und der Staatsgewalt," *Die Schildgenossen* 7, 1 (January 1927), 76-9; Peter Tischleder, "Die naturrechtliche Grundlage des Staates," *Abendland* 2, 3 (December 1926), 68-71.

[76] Peter Tischleder, *Der Staat* (Mönchengladbach, 1926), 12.

[77] Peter Tischleder, *Staatsgewalt und katholisches Gewissen*, 102-5.

Gurian, too, was interested in Schmitt: he was one of four students to take Schmitt's 1924-5 seminar on "mass democracy," while Schmitt recalled, decades later, that Gurian had been an intimate member of his circle between 1924 and 1928. And even though Gurian and Schmitt broke off relations around 1929, Gurian continued to recommend his former mentor's works as the most perceptive analyses of Weimar democracy.[78] It might seem perverse to use Schmitt as a paradigmatic example of democratic Rhineland Catholicism. In some ways, it is: Schmitt is a subtle and inconsistent thinker, and the reading I will provide here does not mesh with every word he wrote in the early 1920s.[79] The task is not an idealist reconstruction of Schmitt's *mentalité* at the time, but an analysis of his work in the context in which it was produced and received. We are investigating, that is, the Schmitt that taught at the University of Bonn, published in *Kölnische Volkszeitung*, and gave speeches at *Zentrum* party congresses, and not the Schmitt who became a Nazi and whose hermetic pronouncements have been so inspirational for modern theorists. One of his students and disciples, a priest named Werner Becker, served as chief editor of the aforementioned *Abendland*. Catholic publications at the time ignored his suspiciously heretical *Political Theology* in favor of *Roman Catholicism and Political Form* (1923), the second edition of which (1925) was published in the august *Katholische Gedanke* series, alongside figures of impeccable Catholic credentials.[80]

---

[78] For the roster of students, see Nachlaß Schmitt, RSW265 20081; for the reminiscence about Gurian, see Schmitt and Armin Mohler, *Briefwechsel mit einem seiner Schuler*, ed. Irmgard Huhn and Piet Tommissen (Berlin, 1995), 94-5; Gurian to Thieme, 5 August 1932, Folder 163/28, Nachlaß Thieme.

[79] Gopal Balakrishnan, for one, thinks that *Political Theology* and *Roman Catholicism and Political Form* are radically incompatible. Balakrishnan, *The Enemy* (New York, 2000), 151-2.

[80] Joseph Bendersky, *Carl Schmitt* (Princeton, 1983), 50ff. Catholics did not love everything about Schmitt: he was widely attacked for ignoring the absolute value of the individual, as he had been doing for years despite the Scheler-inflected *Personalismus* of his colleagues. See, for instance, Ernst Michel to Karl Muth, 18 November 1923, Nachlaß Muth; Romano Guardini, "Rettung des Politischen," *Die Schildgenossen* 4, 3 (1924), 112-21, here 119. Karl Neundörfer argued, like John McCormick would later, that Schmitt fell back into the same Romanticism he saw in others. Karl Neundörfer, "Politische Form und religiöser Glaube: Eine Bücherbescprechung," *Die Schildgenossen* 5, 4 (1925), 323-31.

Schmitt's achievement was to show, more powerfully than any other Catholic of the 1920s, that the Catholic Church was profoundly uninterested in the question of political form. It could thus exist alongside democratic and parliamentary states without giving up one iota of its identity. The prerogative of the Church was to represent its own interests in the polity, and work in tandem with the state, but the state itself was secular and its form was immaterial. Schmitt begins by asking himself about "the incomprehensible political power of Roman Catholicism": how can the institution embody the most precise political logic, while simultaneously accommodating itself with a variety of political arrangements? Opponents of the church have pointed this out as an instance of hypocrisy or dogmatic vagueness, but Schmitt argues that precisely the opposite is the case. In order to be truly universal, the Church must be able to contain all oppositions within itself. The church is best understood, Schmitt decides, as "a complex of opposites […] There appears to be no antithesis it does not embrace."[81] The Church is not an institution like any other, but rather the one and only vicar of Christ on earth: "The Pope is not the Prophet but the Vicar of Christ." Vicar means, essentially, "deputy": the Pope "represents" Christ insofar as he has been appointed as the deputy representative of Christ's awesome power on earth. This form of power—absolute authority rooted in "the ethos of belief"—is called "representation." Schmitt uses *repräsentieren* to describe the papal relationship with Christ. "Represent" does not mean, here, aesthetic representation, but a literal re-presentation: in the person of the pope, Christ and his unquestioned authority are made, once again, present. The Pope's role is to assume a place in "an unbroken chain linked with the personal mandate and concrete person of Christ."[82]

---

[81] Schmitt, *Roman Catholicism and Political* Form, trans. G.L. Ulmen (Westport, 1996), 7.

[82] Ibid. 14. For a perceptive and more complete account of Schmitt's theory, see Duncan Kelly, "Carl Schmitt's Political Theory of Representation," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 65, 1 (2004): 113-134. Kelly argues that the concept of representation, and not the more famous notion of the political, is the key to Schmitt's constitutional theories.

The book is not, however, a clarion call for theocracy: in Schmitt's telling, there used to be a great many "political" institutions in this sense, such as the House of Lords. But they have all disappeared into the maw of modernity and the economistic thinking it entails. The political is not a phenomenon of matter or of calculation, but of belief and authority. In the modern age, economics and calculability have colonized every sphere of social life save one: the Church, which survives now as the sole representative of a bygone age when Europe knew about belief, and it knew about politics. Representation "is not a materialist concept," and in a materialist age it has been forgotten. The Church, which is not charged with government, merely "wishes to live with the state in a special community in which two representations confront each other as partners"; it wants to "deliberate as an equal partner with the state, and thereby create new law."[83] The *political form* of this state is irrelevant from the Church's perspective: what matters is its "ethos" and its willingness to collaborate with the Church and other "natural communities" as equals. While Schmitt was idiosyncratic in many regards, and would only become moreso after his 1926 excommunication, his political theory here is directly a product of the Catholic Rhineland and the Center Party.

So, to sum up: Catholic political culture in the Rhineland was, in many respects, quite similar to its counterparts elsewhere. It was anti-étatiste and generally supported corporatist attempts to take the social turn without landing in the heresy of nation-state sovereignty; meanwhile, it was tempted by authoritarianism while remaining in theory indifferent to political form. It differed in two major ways, which helped to make it the most representative forerunner of Christian Democracy (unsurprising, as the most significant Christian Democratic party would be born in the Rhineland). First: it was invested in modern forms of economic management and growth. Rhenish Catholic economics and social scientists seriously desired a robust, industrial economy, albeit one

[83] Schmitt, *Roman Catholicism and Political Form* 25, 30.

that would avoid class conflict and protect private property. Second: it was dedicated, in a more serious way than was the case elsewhere, to the proposition that Catholicism could flourish under any political form, including democracy. French and Austrian Catholics might say such a thing under their breath, or might define "democracy" in such an extraordinary way that their insincerity can be understood. Rhenish Catholics, however, had been developing civil-society institutions and a political party under both a Protestant empire and a Protestant-socialist Republic.

That said, though, the story from here on is not as simple as "Rhenish Catholicism marches to victory." First of all, Rhenish Catholicism itself was quite a complex phenomenon. Authoritarian politics, and Nazism, were popular in the later 1920s, while there was, as we've seen, little genuine commitment to the Weimar Republic among Center politicians. The Center remained, that is to say, an organization for the defense of the Church and its values, and not a genuinely republican, democratic party. This was not possible until "democracy" itself changed in tenor, which would not happen until the 1940s. The story of how all of this happened can no longer be told in the *milieux* that I have set up in Part I: in the 1930s, as we'll see in Part II, Catholicism became transnational, as these three *milieux* encountered and shaped one another in the combustible climate of the 1930s.

Part II: Catholicism between Civil Society and the Corporate State: The Twin Birth of Personalism and Anti-Totalitarianism, 1934-7

And so, with Leo's Encyclical pointing the way and furnishing the light, a true Catholic social science has arisen, which is daily fostered and enriched by the tireless efforts of those chosen men whom We have termed auxiliaries of the Church.
--Pius XI, *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931)

Introduction to Part II

As I have shown in Part I, Catholic intellectuals across Europe were critical of the nation-state and its arrogation of total sovereignty and the monopoly on violence, even though their positive political (and philosophical) projects varied dramatically. These three milieux were operating quite separately, which was eminently possible in the 1920s, when states and intellectuals tended to be more narrowly focused on their own problems. But in the 1930s, European political culture took a transnational turn: Robert Brasillach, one of Maurras's most disciples, declared "la fin de l'après-guerre" in 1931. The Spanish Civil War, which dragged poets and funds from across Europe into a fundamentally local conflict, is the exemplar here. The *milieux* of Part One either collapsed or shifted dramatically in orientation. Francophone Catholicism was thrown into disarray by the 1926 papal condemnation of the *Action française*, which sent Catholics in France and Belgium looking for new, and more properly Catholic, orientations. The Catholicism of the Rhineland became a Catholicism of internal or genuine exile, as the Nazi *Gleichschaltung* shattered the previously robust civil-society traditions of the region. In Central Europe, the civil-war atmosphere of Austria led Catholicism down an increasingly paramilitary and authoritarian road; meanwhile, the looming threat of *Anschluss* forced Catholics into new transnational alliances (they, too, would join the Rhinelanders in exile from 1938 onwards).

In response to an obviously continent-wide crisis, as the Geneva system collapsed, intellectuals, Catholics included, began to ponder continent-wide solutions, as Catholicism, Popular Front Marxism, and Nazism-Fascism became international phenomena. This is obviously true for the latter two: we all know about the international culture of the Popular Front, and the international vogue for Fascism, which intrigued intellectuals from London to Spain to Paris to Bucharest. Catholicism, though, has not yet been understood as a third major player on the European scene.

Indeed, most accounts of Catholicism in the period, following the lead of Ze'ev Sternhell and John Hellman, have either understood Catholics as "Fascist" or "Democratic," which misunderstands the axes of Catholic intellectual life.[1]

Catholics shared much with their socialist and Fascist competitors, just as they had shared so much with the Radicalism, Austro-Marxism, or National Liberalism of the 1920s. They were full participants in the spirit of the 1930s, which sought to overcome the barren parliamentary politics of the past in favor of something new, muscular, authoritarian—and European in scope. In short, Catholicism embraced the politics of youth, along with everyone else. They began to respond less to Leo XIII's *Ralliement*, or even the pieties of Windthorst, than to the crusading rhetoric of *Quas Primas*, the 1925 encyclical that called for a return to "Christ the King" in the earthly realm. The Belgian José Streel's *Les jeunes gens et la politique* (1932) set the tone: Streel and his colleagues were tired of the old Catholic parties and their "complacent senility", preferring instead a virile, muscular Catholicism that would rehape the world in its own image.[2] Catholics tended to agree with Streel that the solutions of the past, whether those solutions were "monarchy" or "Catholic political parties," were bankrupt. The *Zentrum*, the PPI, the Action française, the Catholic Party in Belgium, even the Austrian Christian Socials: these movements no longer exercised the hearts and minds of the Catholic youth, largely because so many of them had been condemned or outlawed. Catholics, like socialists and Fascists, moved beyond the logic of party.

There is more than one way, though, to move beyond the old-style party politics that had become Catholics' stock in trade since the "Culture Wars" of the late nineteenth century. The claim to be "above politics," then as now, can be used to legitimate an enormous variety of political

[1] Martin Conway, one of few historians attempting to correct this deficit, points this out at the beginning of his pathbreaking essay, "Building the Christian City: Catholics and Politics in Interwar Francophone Belgium," *op. cit.*

[2] Ibid. 128.

positions. Catholics sought to inhabit this newly-vigorous public sphere in two major and relatively distinct ways; the two chapters in Part II will be dedicated to charting these two transnational forms of Catholicism (like socialism, transnational Catholicism was riven by conflict in the 1930s). Both of them, it should be noted, stream organically from the Catholic social thought charted in Part I, although they drew markedly different lessons from it.

In Chapter 4, we will explore what I'm calling "civil-society Catholicism." These Catholics, in keeping with the Church's longstanding allergy to political participation as normally understood, held that religion was fundamentally a feature of civil society and had no business interfering in statecraft. Jacques Maritain and Waldemar Gurian were key intellectual exponents of this form of Catholicism, while they oversaw a constellation of movements and organizations, firmly controlled by the hierarchy, known as Catholic Action (youth organizations, workers' organizations, farmer's organizations, and so on). Pope Pius XI had been supporting these movements in earnest since the early 1920s, when it became clear that traditional Catholic politics would no longer work in the era of Mussolini. Catholic Action did not explode in significance throughout the rest of Catholic Europe until the rest of Europe followed Mussolini (from about 1930 onwards). Even in Austria, Catholic Action served as a counterweight to Dollfuss's regime; tellingly, given the suspicion of the "party" that was everywhere in these years, the Austrian hierarchy disbanded the old Christian-Social *Vereine* in favor of more clerical Catholic Action movements.[3] Maritain, Gurian, and Catholic Action-ideologues sought to leaven political life from within, pervading all political parties and systems with the spirit of Christian charity. This would serve to bend the arc of history towards Christ, without actually tying Christ's name or mission to a fallen, terrestrial movement.

[3] Laura Gellott, "Defending Catholic Interests in the Christian State: The Role of Catholic Action in Austria, 1933-1938," *Catholic Historical Review* 74 (1988), 571-89.

Many Catholics, however, thought this smacked of wishy-washy opportunism: Catholics, they pointed out, were bound to a quite specific set of economic and social teachings, and were duty-bound to support them in whatever fashion they could. General de Castelnau and his *Croix de Feu*, for instance, were harshly critical of Catholic Action for its unwillingness to question the Third Republic and its legitimacy. Castelnau and the like, who will be covered in Chapter 5, believed that the Church should forthrightly ally itself with certain political regimes, as parliamentary democracy was manifestly incapable of inaugurating a Christian social order on earth (I will refer to this as "corporatist Catholicism"). This was not a Catholicism of party, though: it was a Catholicism that rejected parties altogether and was to incarnate itself in the *partyless state*. It must be said that history seemed to be on their side, once we think about Spain, Portugal, Austria, Croatia, and Hungary (and France, if we include Vichy). Indeed, authoritarian Catholicism was perhaps the default political option of the 1930s. It was also just as transnational in focus as socialism and Fascism: especially as mediated through the Vatican, corporatists in France, Austria, Germany, Spain, and beyond were in constant contact and were developing a common political and economic discourse. They drew on the social theories, particularly the economic ones, that were covered in Part I, as well as the anti-democratic and anti-liberal sympathies nourished in 1920s Catholicism.

The Vatican itself straddled these positions, in an impossible balancing-act that has led to mountains of controversy over the last seventy years. Pius was certainly glad to be rid of the old partisan Catholicism: he snuffed out the Italian PPI with pleasure, and had tumultuous relations with the German Center. Robert Pollard defines the policy of the Vatican in the 1920s and 1930s as about "Concordats and Catholic Action"—both of them strategies to pursue Catholic interests without unruly Catholic parties.[4] These strategies were primarily followed in non-Catholic states like

[4] John F. Pollard, *The Vatican and Italian Fascism,* 1929-32 (Cambridge, 1985), 4. See 24ff for the Italian origins of Catholic Action.

Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy: when state-capture, as normally understood, was off the table, Pius turned towards alternative, and not directly political, means to pursue Catholic interests. On the other hand, in many parts of Europe Catholic state-capture remained on the table, and here the Vatican showed a slightly different face. Pius XI is the Pope of Catholic Action, yes, but he is also the Pope of *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931), an encyclical providing quite precise social and economic guidelines. Meanwhile, the Church granted certain degrees of support to so-called "clerical" regimes in Hungary, Austria, Spain, Portugal, Croatia, Slovakia, and Vichy France. This will be investigated in Chapter 5. At this point, though, I do want to register that this "support" has often been over-estimated: to take one example, the Vatican was not behind Franco's rebellion, had developed passable relations with the Spanish Republic, and even rebuffed Franco's first few efforts to claim official Vatican support for his movement. Meanwhile, the Vatican was never especially enthusiastic about Vichy—they did not conclude a Concordat with the state, for instance. It is doubtless true that many bishops, notably in Austria and France, were supporters of these regimes, but this does mean that we can say in any simple way that the Vatican robustly supported authoritarian politics.

So while civil-society Catholicism and corporatist Catholicism were often at one another's throats, especially over hot-button issues like the invasion of Abyssinia and the Spanish Civil War, they were fundamentally united in ways that would allow their *rapprochement* after World War II. It is worth pointing out, too, that these divisions were not air-tight, any more than the geographical *milieu* of the 1920s were hermetically sealed from one another. Some figures, including most notably Emmanuel Mounier, shuttled back and forth between these positions, which was bewildering both for his friends and for later historians. Léon Degrelle, to take another example, had his start in Catholic Action and used their characteristic language to support a clearly political movement (the Rexists).

They were all drawing on the shared heritage of the 1920s, of course, but even more than this, Catholics in both of these transnational circles developed a new political concept that would have a great future: anti-totalitarianism. Catholics of all stripes despised both Nazism and Communism, as they were the two greatest threats to the integrity of the Church and her preferred social order (insofar as both were dedicated to étatiste political solutions). Catholics developed the concept of "totalitarianism" as a shorthand to register this joint disapproval. They could not know that "joint opposition to Nazism and Communism" would be the *sine qua non* of participation in the post-1945 order. And nobody had better anti-totalitarian credentials than the Catholics. They had, as we'll see, invented the category.

Knights of the Total: Carl Schmitt and Karl Eschweiler

While the extant literature almost uniformly credits "totalitarianism theory" to secularists (either American political scientists or German socialists), historically speaking, Catholics were clearly the innovators.[5] "Bolshevism and Fascism," declared one Anglo-Catholic sociologist in 1935,

[5] I have pursued this line of argumentation more fully in James Chappel, "The Catholic Origins of Totalitarianism Theory in Interwar Europe." *Modern Intellectual History* 9, 3 (November 2011), 261-90. For interpretations crediting the German left, see, among others, Anson Rabinbach, "Moments of Totalitarianism", *History and Theory* 45 (2006), 72-100; Ian Kershaw, *The Nazi Dictatorship*, Fourth ed., (New York, 2000), 23-5; Hans Maier, "'Totalitarismus' und 'politische Religionen': Konzepte des Diktaturvergleichs," *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 43 (1995), 387-405; and, more broadly, Schmeitzner, ed., *Totalitarismuskritik von links: Deutsche Diskurse im 20. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 2007) and William David Jones, *The Lost Debate: German Socialist Intellectuals and Totalitarianism* (Urbana, 1999). Abbott Gleason, while avoiding a univocal origin story, focuses on leftist figures and almost entirely ignores the Catholic narrative, as is belief by his assertion that the concept was "never very important" in 1930s France. Gleason, *Totalitarianism* 143. These interpretations rely primarily on Paul Tillich, "The Totalitarian State and the Claims of the Church," *Social Research* 1 (1934), 405-433; Herbert Marcuse, "The Struggle Against Liberalism in the Totalitarian View of the State," in *Negations: Essays in Critical Theory* (Boston, 1968), 3-42. The same was true of the French left: see *Qu'est-ce que le Fascisme?* (Paris, 1935), 12. Since they both use the category pioneered by the Italians to investigate the new German reality, while not considering the Soviet case (explicitly in Tillich's case, implicitly in Marcuse's), they cannot be considered as exemplars of mature totalitarianism theory. For an account crediting American political science, see Walter Schlangen, *Die Totalitarismustheorie* (Stuttgart, 1976), Chapter 3. For an example that gives the liberal and left-wing versions together, while still ignoring the Catholics, see Gerhard Lozek et al., *Die Totalitarismus-Doktrin im Antikommunismus* (Berlin, 1985), Chapter 2. Many point to a 1929 article in the *London Times* as the founding moment of true totalitarianism theory, as Bolshevism is mentioned, too. In a way, though, it becomes the exception that proves the rule. The article in question was not, as often implied, written in the paper's editorial voice, but was a report of a lecture by Christopher Dawson, one of Britain's most reactionary Catholics. On this, see Markus Huttner, *Totalitarismus und säkulare Religionen* (Bonn, 1999), 30. Most instances of non-Catholic, mature totalitarianism theory before 1936 only mention Bolshevism as totalitarian in passing. I.L. Kandel, *The Making of Nazis* (New York, 1935), 131-8; Winfred Ernest Garrison, *Intolerance*

"are at one in theory of government."[6] The Vatican, too, arrived at totalitarianism theory in 1936, as seen in the Holy Office's never-issued document, entitled "Propositions [to be Condemned] on Racism, Nationalism, Communism, Totalitarianism."[7]This had become commonplace in Catholic social science by this time, as we'll see, and was still extremely rare among non-Catholics.

The beauty of totalitarianism theory, from the Catholic point of view, was that it lumped together Catholicism's enemies in a single category, allowing the Church to portray itself as an institution locked in a single, titanic struggle, instead of as one competing political and social voice amongst others. In France, Catholics were responding to the rise of the hated Popular Front; any theory that could equate Bolshevism and Nazism delegitimized the very concept of a Moscow-backed, anti-fascist *Front Populaire*. In Austria, Catholic supporters of Dollfuss's *Ständestaat* were in a similar position: their two major enemies were the Austro-Marxists, just defeated in a civil war but still a threat, and the National Socialists, whose desire for Anschluss was finding worrying resonance within Austria itself. Totalitarianism theory allowed supporters of Dollfuss to undercut the National Socialists' claim to represent a bulwark against Communism.

The Catholic outrage over "totalitarianism", in addition to being politically convenient, can also be traced back to the fact that many Catholics – those who supported National Socialism – actually *supported* the "total state" between 1932 and 1934. Indeed, one of German Catholicism's erstwhile favored sons – Carl Schmitt – turned to the "total state" in 1931, which was the moment when totalitarianism turned from "local descriptor of Italian Fascism" into "novel concept of

---

(New York, 1934), 246; Souvarine, "Les journées de fevrier," *Critique Sociale* 11 (March 1934), 201-5, 204. Souvarine does use it more often in his landmark *Staline, aperçu historique du bolchévisme* (Paris, 1935). He was essentially alone, however, among the French left. The more mainstream version of Souvarine's anti-Stalinism—André Gide's *Retour de l'U.R.S.S.* (Paris, 1936), for instance—does not make use of it.

[6] Bernard Bell, *A Catholic Looks at His World* (New York, 1936), 53. These lectures were originally delivered in 1935.

[7] Peter Godman, *Hitler and the Vatican* (New York, 2004) 199.

political science." Schmitt's turn, indeed, created "totalitarianism" vs. "anti-totalitarianism" as a debate within Catholicism several years before it appeared elsewhere. By this point, Schmitt was something of a pariah in Catholic circles, although still treated with great respect. He had been excommunicated in 1926 and, perhaps an even greater sin, moved to hated Berlin, and made his legal name by supporting the rights of the national *Reich* over the regions.[8] But after his turn to Nazism and the total state, Catholics turned on him *en masse*. With the exception of Jean de Fabrègues, all of the major figures to be discussed in Part II—Gaston Fessard, Waldemar Gurian, Dietrich von Hildebrand, Eugen Kogon, Paul Landsberg, Jacques Maritain, and François Perroux—attacked Schmitt by name in the process of conceptualizing their own new, anti-totalitarian breed of Catholic politics.

Schmitt is probably the most important source for the language of the "total state," which would quickly become "anti-totalitarianism"; his two articles on the "total state [*totaler Staat*]," which appeared in Karl Prinz von Rohan's *Europäische Revue* in 1931 and 1933, are ground zero of the tradition. The first volume with "total state" in the title, Heinz Ziegler's *Autoritärer oder Totaler Staat* (1932), was written in direct response to Schmitt, while the second was written by Ernst Forsthoff, one of Schmitt's pupils and disciples (*Der Totale Staat* (1933)).[9] This judgment, I should add, is not mine alone: several articles that appeared between 1932 and 1935 credited Schmitt with introducing the notion of the total into the political vocabulary in his aforementioned articles for *Europäische Revue*, while more recent scholars have seconded this verdict.[10]

---

[8] Balakrishnan, *The Enemy*, 168ff. Some Catholics had already argued that, spiritually, he had always been a Northerner: Johannes Kirschweng, "Der Romantiker Carl Schmitt," *Rhein-Mainische Volkszeitung* 56, 16 (21 January 1926), 1.

[9] Heinz O. Ziegler, *Autoritärer oder Totaler Staat* (Tübingen, 1932), 6n; this is discussed in William Scheuerman, *Carl Schmitt* (Lanham, 1999), 100-101. On the relationship between Forsthoff and Schmitt, see *Briefwechsel Ernst Forsthoff - Carl Schmitt (1926-1974)*, ed. Angela Reinthal (Berlin, 2007)

[10] Richard Behrendt, "Die Totalität des Politischen" *Der Christliche Ständestaat* 2, 17 (28 April 1935), 395-7; Gustav Gundlach, "Zur Arbeitsdienstpflicht," *Stimmen der Zeit* 124 (1932/3), 56-9; Friedrich Fuchs, "Der totale Staat und seine

In the chapters that follow, it is important to keep in mind what "totalitarianism" meant in Catholic social thought. Schmitt and his interlocutors were writing before Orwell's *1984,* Arendt's *Origins of Totalitarianism,* Freidrich and Brzezinski's work on totalitarianism, and everything else that has created our own nightmarish associations. For them, totalitarianism was not the rejection of liberal democracy and capitalism, but its very essence. For Schmitt, in an analysis that clearly builds upon his earlier works, particularly *Crisis of Parliamentary Democracy* and *The Concept of the Political*, the total state is a product of the nineteenth-century liberal state. Moreover, his initial development of the concept was a gambit to save Weimar democracy, albeit in Brüning's authoritarian form, and not to underwrite the National Socialist revolution (Schmitt was not yet involved with the Nazis). Schmitt's invocation of the total state was meant to defend Brüning's emergency economic decrees. He pointed out that the state/society distinction was already, as a matter of fact, collapsing: in 1928, 53% of the German economy was implicated, in some way or another, with the German state. The failure to recognize the fact that political and civil society are *already* imbricated is leading to the misinformed outcries over Brüning's economic decrees, which are rooted in a failure to understand the nature of the modern state.[11]

Although the "total state" would soon become a watchword for "Nazism," the fact that Schmitt meant it at the time as, precisely, a defense of the Republic tells us something important about the idea's genealogy. The total state was meant to save democracy and update it for new conditions, beyond the liberal state of the nineteenth century. *The debate about totalitarianism is not the same as the debate about democracy*. As in the 1920s, "democracy" was not the language through which these debates were carried out: the debate was about the role of the state in the social order, and not

---

Grenze," *Hochland* 30, 1 (1932-3), 558-60; Karl Thieme, *Deutsche evangelische Christen auf dem Wege zur katholischen Kirche* (Züirch, 1934), 42; more recently, Abbot Gleason, *Totalitarianism* (New York, 1995), 18.

[11] Carl Schmitt, "Die Wendung zum Totalen Staat," *Europäische Revue* 7, 4 (1931), 241-50

the form of that state. Schmitt's radically anti-pluralist contention was that, to stave off civil war, the state would have to understand the truth about itself and assert its dominance over subsidiary groups, as Brüning was in fact then doing. Without a strong political presence, the state would become no more than a battle ground: "Through pluralization, the turn to the total is not transcended [aufgehoben], but rather parceled, in that each organized social power-complex—from choirs and sport clubs to armed self-protection—seeks to actualize [verwirklichen] the totality in and for itself."[12]

Of course, the Weimar Republic did collapse, and Schmitt and many other Catholics used the language of the "total state" to signal their support for the new, National Socialist regime. In almost no case, though, were these writers truly Schmittean: instead, based on a misunderstanding of the nature of the National Socialist regime, they equated the Nazi "total state" with the authoritarian, corporatist state that many had been clamoring for in the 1920s. As this became clear, almost all Catholic intellectuals turned away from Nazism. For all of the *Sturm und Drang* about Catholic Nazism, it remains the case that almost no prominent Catholic intellectuals or theologians gave significant support to Nazism beyond about 1934. In the heady months of 1933, though, many praised the "total state." Robert Grosche, another Rhenish Catholic, praised the coming of the total state in a widely reprinted 1933 lecture.[13] A writer for *Schönere Zukunft,* also in 1933, praised the "total revolution" in Germany, warning that those who overlooked the fact that Nazism aimed for *das Ganze* were sorely mistaken.[14] Eugen Kogon, who as we will see was initially a strong supporter of

---

[12] Ibid. 247.

[13] Grosche, "Theologie des Reiches," *Schönere Zukunft* 8, 43 (23 July 1933), 1037-8. It also appeared in *Kölnische Volkszeitung.*

[14] Dr. Otto Wilhelm Helltorff (Berlin), "Die 'totale Revolution' in Deutschland und die Katholiken," *Schönere Zukunft* 8, 41 (9 July 1933), 976-7. This was, according to Peter Eppel, a pseudonym. Peter Eppel, *Zwischen Kreuz und Hakenkreuz* (Vienna, 1980), 372.

the National Socialist experiment, praised its "totalitarian" qualities in 1934.[15] Ground zero for pro-totalitarian Catholics was the notorious 1933 conference at Maria Laach, "Idee und Aufbau der Reich," held during what Klaus Scholder has called "the summer of political theology" and organized by Franz Xaver Landmesser, head of the *Katholische Akademikerverband* and one of the few acolytes of Othmar Spann in the Rhineland.[16] In addition to Schmitt, participants included Grosche, Ildefons Herwegen, Damasus Winzen, Albert Mirgeler, Martin Spahn, Emil Ritter, Karl Eschweiler, and even Theodor Brauer—an honor roll of National Socialist Catholic intellectuals. In an essay a few months later in which Heinrich Getzeny discussed the unforgettable summer of political theology, every name he mentioned had been present at this conference, at which the total state had been a major topic of discussion.[17]

Emil Ritter, one of the attendees and the editor of *Germania* (formerly a *Zentrum* organ), was also behind another fascinating document of Catholic totalitarianism: *Katholisch-konservatives Erbgut*, a collection of essays published in 1934 and designed to repackage the Catholic heritage as a long precursor to National Socialism. In his foreword, Ritter gives voice to Karamazov Catholicism. "Liberalism is the enemy for everyone [i.e. the Catholic heroes described in the book], from Schlegel to Hitze." Liberalism is defined as the heretical separation of church, state, and Volk, which were being reunited in the "total state" of National Socialism, which would spring from "the living *Volk*,

---

[15] Eugen Kogon, *Die Idee des Christlichen Ständestaates,* 298.

[16] This list of participants is taken from a letter from Grosche to Heinrich Scharp, 23 April 1933, Box 3, Nachlaß Walter Dirks, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Bonn. Grosche was apparently trying to widen the ideological spectrum by inviting Scharp, the editor of *Rhein-Mainische Volkszeitung*, and Dirks, his left-Catholic protégé; so far as I can tell, they wisely did not take the bait. For Landmesser and Spann, see Martin Schneller, *Zwischen Romantik und Fascismus* (Stuttgart, 1970) 134-6. On Maria Laach and its philo-Nazism, see Marcel Albert, *Die Benediktinerabtei Maria Laach une der Nationalsozialismus* (Paderborn, 2004).

[17] Heinrich Getzeny, "Wie weit ist die politische Theologie des Reiches heute noch sinnvoll?" *Hochland* 30, 2 (Sept 33), 556-8. The speeches were not published; my assertion that the "total state" was discussed is based both on the fact that many of these people defended the "total state" elsewhere, and the testimony in Felix Blindow, *Carl Schmitts Reichsordnung* (Berlin, 1999), 33.

which is a community created by God, and defined by blood and fate."[18] This is followed by essays by, among others, Jakob Baxa and Eugen Kogon—two of Spann's most prominent students—who reformulate the Catholic social theories of Adam Müller and Karl von Vogelsang, respectively, as predecessors of the Nazi total state.[19]

From our perspective, the most interesting Catholic defender of the "total state" was Karl Eschweiler, who came out of the same open-minded Rhenish milieu as Waldemar Gurian. Indeed, he baptized Gurian's children, and he organized the first translations of Jacques Maritain into German. Maritain, for his part, believed that Eschweiler was the man to reproduce the Meudon-model of Thomist study circles in Germany.[20] In a 1926 letter to Gurian, Grosche referred to the three as something of a triumvirate, worrying that they all overestimated the potential of neo-Thomism.[21] Eschweiler was also close with Carl Schmitt from around 1925 until his premature death in 1936, and had been friendly with Scheler in the mid-1920s (he wrote a long obituary for Scheler in a French journal in 1928[22]). What's interesting, then, about Eschweiler is that his formation was, in many ways, so similar to Gurian's: this explains the disappointment that Gurian felt—he told Maritain the revelation was "extremely painful"—when Eschweiler became one of the most prominent National Socialist Catholics in Germany.[23]

---

[18] Ritter, "Vorwort," in *Katholisch-konservatives Erbgut: Eine Auslese für die Gegenwart*, hrsg. von Emil Ritter, (Freiburg, 1934), v-xi, here vii, xi, viii.

[19] They avoid the terminology, but the index—presumably prepared by Ritter—refers to both of their esays as discussions of the total state.

[20] Eschweiler to Maritain, 20 May 1926, Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim.

[21] Grosche to Gurian, 25 October 1926, Box 3, Folder 22, Gurian Papers.

[22] Eschweiler, "En Allemagne: Max Scheler," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 1, 1 (October 1928), 112-22.

[23] Gurian to Maritain, 22 July 1935, Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim. Never one to back down from a confrontation, Gurian wrote to Eschwiler too, complaining about attacks from disciples of Eschweiler and Schmitt in the pages of *Deutsches Volkstum*. Gurian to Eschweiler, 23 December 1933, Box 3, Folder 6, Gurian Papers.

What's interesting about Eschweiler is that, unlike Schmitt, he came to the "total state" for perfectly orthodox reasons: he was speaking the language of Catholicism. He actually came to Nazism several years before Schmitt, writing an essay in *Der Ring* in 1931 in which he laid out his vision of a Hitler-friendly Catholicism. For Eschweiler, there are duties to God and duties to Caesar—these are fundamentally distinct, and there is no middle ground between them. "To the Caesar, or the State, belongs all that is of this world."[24] The sphere of law and politics is neatly separated from the sphere of religion, the Church can have no role to play in temporal affairs, and the Zentrum can only appear as unwarranted clericalism. The nation, the province of Caesar, thus deserves total control over the things of this earth, which it exercises by way of the authoritarian state. "The nation is a true and noble public domain [*Gemeingut*] […] The nation naturally fulfills itself in political [staatlichen] existence."[25] In a particularly revealing letter from 1932, Eschweiler defends Schmitt from Leo Strauss's celebrated criticisms of *Der Begriff des Politischen*, arguing that Strauss, as a Jew, is incapable of truly political thought: their legalistic understanding of religious dogma keeps them from understanding either faith or politics, which are predicated on the strict division of labor outlined above.[26]

Eschweiler used the theories of Catholic Action when he actually turned to the total state. In a May 1933 essay, entitled "Neun Sätze über das katholische Aktion," he makes an exceptionally detailed version of the argument that he was making in newspapers and sermons across Germany at the time. Following Bellarmine, Eschweiler claimed that the church and state can be defined as the two "societates perfectas" to which we have access on earth. He here clearly tracks Schmitt's second

---

[24] Karl Eschweiler, "Der nationale Gedanke als reale Vernunft." *Der Ring* 4, 31 (31 July 1931), 577-81, here 581

[25] Ibid. 580.

[26] Karl Eschweiler to Carl Schmitt, 20 September 1932, RSW 265 3367, Nachlaß Schmitt.

article on the total state, also published in 1933 and relying on Bellarmine: "every true state, as a *societas perfectas* of the temporal world, is a total state."[27] While Eschweiler defends a strict separation of church and state—there are two societates perfectas, not one—he is clear that this bears no resemblance to the liberal settlement. As Eschweiler had explained earlier, "The differentiation of 'state and church' was first made possible, and first established, in Christianity."[28] His point of view was closer to Gentile himself: "State and Church," Gentile had written in 1930, "are two totalitarian regimes. Their agreement can only arise from a self-delimitation." [29] The Catholic Church expressed itself via non-political Catholic Action (the ideology of the Concordat), while the Nazi state could fully embrace our political and national existence.

Interestingly, the appeal of this settlement for Eschweiler, as for other totalitarian Catholics, is that the confusing and hateful category of "society" is abolished. The theological-political unity of the Middle Ages, Eschweiler complained, had not been split into two—church and state—but rather into three: church, state, and a new entity called "civil society [bürgerliche Gesellschaft]."[30] In this sphere of public life, the citizen enjoys freedom from the two perfect societies, and it is in this Godless realm that the twin evils of international capitalism and international Marxism were allowed to flourish. Catholics, in their support for civil society and for the clerical, *Zentrum* politics with which it was associated, have been defending this bankrupt tri-partite division, but with the rise of National Socialism, the godless *Ralliement* can mercifully draw to a close. The state can become a

---

[27] Carl Schmitt, "Weiterentwicklung des Totalen Staats in Deutschland," *Europäische Revue* 9, 2 (1933), 65-70, here 67.

[28] Eschweiler, "Die Kirche als Politische Macht." Typescript of a 1929 address available in Carl Schmitt's library (RSW265 20239, Nachlaß Schmitt).

[29] Quoted Besier and Piombo, *The Holy See and Hitler's Germany* 80.

[30] Eschweiler, "Neun Sätze über Katholische Aktion." A typescript, dated May 1933, that Schmitt returned to Eschweiler with his letter of 4 July 1933, RSW 265 12948, Nachlaß Schmitt. Here page 2.

total state, as it should, and religious authority can, by withdrawing from the temporal realm, more truly reflect the glory of God through a spiritualization of papal authority.[31]

Abyssinia: Introducing Two Forms of Anti-Totalitarianism

Schmitt, Eschweiler, and all of the totalitarian Catholics reject the old political solutions: Catholic defense parties, traditionalist monarchism, and so on. Like others in the 1930s, they turned towards more radical solutions divorced from the logic of party politics. Their opponents—the vast majority of Catholics who identified as anti-totalitarian—followed them at least that far. There was more than one way, though, to be anti-totalitarian. To set up the next two chapters, I will here briefly canvas one of the major debates between civil-society and corporatist Catholicism. There was, we'll see, a cleavage within Catholicism, but this was not between "democratic" or "liberal" Catholicism and "authoritarian" Catholicism, but rather between civil-society Catholics, who argued that religion should abandon the field of politics altogether, and corporatist Catholics, who argued that certain forms of political-economic order were specifically enjoined by the Catholic faith. The point here is not at all to retrospectively chastise Catholics for abandoning democracy in its hour of need: almost nobody in mid-1930s Europe believed in parliamentary democracy. The point, instead, is to more faithfully reconstruct the twin Catholic internationalisms of the 1930s by moving away from "democracy" as an analytical axis.

The Abyssinian invasion was, for Catholics, the most divisive international event of the 1930s. In a 1941 lecture bemoaning the divided state of his homeland, Gaston Fessard dated the split to March 1935 and the debate over Ethiopia; a few years later, in a touching reminiscence of his generation of Catholics, Daniel Villey identified that same event as the foundational controversy of

[31] Ibid. 4-7.

the 1930s.[32] Maurras and the Action Française made their most principled stand of the 1930s over the issue of sanctions, publishing a list of politicians to be assassinated (a stunt for which Maurras duly served jail time). But the nature of the confrontation was not what we would expect, just as the divisions in 1930s Catholic life were more complex than has previously been noted. The controversy did not at all pit "fascist" against "anti-fascist" Catholics: those supporting Mussolini against those opposing him. Instead, the struggle was between civil-society Catholics—who did not believe that Catholicism enjoined any political commitments at all—and corporatist Catholics, who believed that it did.

Maritain and the group of "civil society Catholics" he led were not anti-fascist in any recognizable way. Instead, the position taken by Gurian, Maritain and the rest was studiously apolitical: the position of the Catholic intellectual, they held, was not to support or oppose fascism, but to act as witnesses of an eternal religious truth that only obliquely informs politics, and never in a partisan way. Their manifesto, "Pour le justice et la paix," does not condemn fascism, war, or imperialism—that is, it does not take any of the routes that we would expect an anti-invasion manifesto to take, or the ones that were, in fact, taken in manifestoes on the left (such as the one that appeared in *Le Populaire* on 5 October).[33] "The question in no way concerns the sympathies or antipathies that one might have in regard to the internal regime of Italy," the manifesto states. "[I]t concerns justice and eternal values."[34] The manifesto does not discuss any of the concrete issues at stake—slavery in Ethiopia, the legitimacy of the League, or the advisability of sanctions—and

---

[32] Fessard, "Le patriotisme français [1941 lecture notes]", Fonds Fessard, Archives Jésuites (Vanves), Box 19, Folder 1, page 2. Daniel Villey, *Redevenir les hommes libres* (Paris, 1946), xx.

[33] It does, however, align with the role of the church suggested by *Vendredi*, the Popular Front journal. Louis Martin-Chaufiere, "L'Eglise d'Italie, le fascisme, et la guerre." *Vendredi* 1, 13 (31 January 1936), 4. The author advises Catholics not to let spiritual and political powers intermingle.

[34] "Pour la justice et la paix," *Sept* 2, 186 (18 October 1935), 5.

explicitly relegates such practical concerns to irrelevance, from the Catholic perspective.[35] Instead, it stakes itself on abstract and universal appeals to peace and justice, arguing that the possible logistical need for Italian expansion is illegitimate, as empirical issues like this cannot impinge on the absolute immorality of wars of conquest. An editorialist at *Sept*, the journalistic home base for these Catholics, explained it best: "The issue is not fascism or anti-fascism, but international justice."[36]

In a sense, they had the Vatican on their side, insofar as Pius XI was loathe to take official positions on ongoing political events. But while the Vatican itself remained silent, the Pope could not strictly control the Italian hierarchy's "orgy of enthusiasm" for the invasion.[37] Many Catholics, in France especially, followed the lead of the Italian clergy and heralded Mussolini's action. This was the position taken by Castelnau's FNC, as well as the one taken by most French Catholic intellectuals, who remained reliant on Maurras, at least in spirit.[38] And there is no doubt what position a Maurrasean Catholic should take: Maurras and his circle violently opposed sanctions, and celebrated the invasion as a glorious exemplar of the new, militarist spirit of the 1930s. The manifesto of this group—the one that occasioned *Pour le justice et la paix*—was *Manifeste des intellectuels français pour la défense de l'Occident*, which was published in *Le Temps* on 4 October 1935. In addition to Maurras, it was signed by the most important French Catholic right-wing intellectuals, some of whom we have met before: Henri Massis, Jean de Fabrègues, Pierre Maxence, and more. Whereas the civil-society manifesto essentially defended peace at any cost, relying upon eternal values of

[35] Mauriac takes the same tack in his article on the subject, bemoaning the cynicism of those who supported Mussolini out of fear that any other move would lead to war. Mauriac, "Cas de conscience," *Sept* 2, 85 (11 October 1935), 4.

[36] [Anonymous], "Communauté européenne et ordre universel," *Sept* 2, 85 (11 October 1935), 1.

[37] Frank Coppa, *The Modern Papacy since 1789* (New York, 1998), 179.

[38] For the FNC, see René Rémond, *Les catholiques dans la France des années 30* (Paris, 1960), 100.

justice and castigating those who were willing to cynically legitimize violence in the name of political reason, these Catholics were willing to do precisely that.

In the manifesto, they make two basic sets of argumentation. First, they argue that Italian Fascism is a great representative of the Roman spirit and should thus be accorded the same rights as every other (imperialist) nation. The civil society Catholics did not respond to this; as we've seen, they thought that the particular merits of Fascism were irrelevant. It was the second issue that was more controversial. The corporatists argued according to *Realpolitik*: if we act against Mussolini in the name of foolish international laws, we are courting European catastrophe.

They argue in terms of politics, not values: "At the hour when we menace Italy with sanctions sure to lead to an unprecedented war, we, French intellectuals, must declare, before world opinion, that we do not want these sanctions or this war. […] The just interests of the Western community would be injured."[39] This is, to be sure, a moral argument, but the premises are not eternal but temporal and diplomatic: the implication is that such considerations may be properly considered by the Catholic as he acts in the world. The political decision to allow Mussolini's invasion is given religious significance: at stake, they argue, "is the notion of man himself." For the civil society Catholics, "man" at his most basic is not a political animal, and must indeed be protected from the political. For those on the right, however, the dignity of man is inextricably wrapped up in politics.

The primary organ for corporatist Catholicism in Austria was *Christliche Ständestaat*, a Dollfuß-supporting journal peopled with many figures discussed in Chapter 2. Both its primary editor and its foreign-affairs correspondent—Dietrich von Hildebrand and Klaus Dohrn—wrote articles defending the invasion. They argued in similar terms, employing an appreciation for

[39] Reproduced in *La Vie Intellectuelle* 38, 2 (25 Oct 35), 258-9.

Fascism's Latin mission alongside steely power politics. "Italy is," Hildebrand argued, "the germ of the Christian West. […] Can anyone seriously treat Italy and Abyssinia as equally great, merely because they are both members of the League of Nations?"[40] Dohrn followed this with a political approach, arguing that the peace of Europe depended on the politics of Stresa and Locarno, not the politics of divisive, punitive fascism; the sanction debate threatens to plunge Europe back into war—"Therefore by all means, 'Down with sanctions!'"[41]

Although the competition between these two groups was sometimes vicious, there were nonetheless significant areas of doctrinal overlap. They agreed with one another, and with the Vatican, about the basic principles of social, economic, and international order: all were to follow the principles of subsidiarity that had been ingrained in all forms of Catholic thinking for decades. This would not become clear until these people found themselves on the same side in 1947-8. The most significant of these concerned, as we would expect, the critique of the state form, which survived in modified forms in the 1930s, even as the political realities which had originally created it had vanished. Both civil-society Catholics and corporatist Catholics, even while fighting tooth and nail against one another, developed sophisticated forms of personalism and anti-totalitarianism, setting up the disappearance of this final chasm in Catholic political thought in the post-1945 period. As we will see in Part III, it was under these banners—and not those of "humanism" or "democracy"—that Catholic intellectuals would legitimate their participation in Christian Democracy and the Cold War.

---

[40] Hildebrand, "Italen und die gegenwärtige öffentliche Meinung der Welt," *Der Christliche Ständestaat* 3, 8 (23 February 1936), 175-8, here 175, 178.

[41] Nikolaus [Klaus] Dohrn, "Italien und Europe," *Der Christliche Ständestaat* 3, 23 (7 June 1936), 539-42, here 542.

Chapter 4: Politics in the Higher Sense: Waldemar Gurian, Jacques Maritain, and Civil-Society Catholicism

It has been demonstrated time and again that all political errors are based in religious ones.
--Franziskus Stratfmann, 1928[1]

Day-to-day politics is not the task of Catholic Action, but politics in the higher sense.
--Pope Pius XI, 1934[2]

Introduction

In 1937, Gaston Fessard, S.J., received a kind letter from a M. François, the secretary of the French Communist Party in Paris's seventh arrondissement. François was inviting Fessard to a lecture and discussion about the possibilities of anti-fascist collaboration between Catholics and Communists, "setting aside the religious question." There was nothing new about this: in the Paris of the Popular Front, ecumenical cooperation against fascism was almost taken for granted. Fessard, though, was uninterested. He responded icily that he would certainly not be attending, as the sorts of collaboration François sought were impossible. Even in the name of anti-fascism, religion cannot be "set aside" in the name of politics. It is, on the contrary, everything.[3] But was this not, François surely wondered, an unwarranted intrusion of religion into the sphere of politics? After all, had not Catholics since Leo XIII maintained that Christ's transcendent Church could not identify itself with any particular political regime or party, leaving Catholics, *qua* citizens, to vote how they chose? Why, then, couldn't Catholics ally with Communists in the political sphere to fight fascism, especially as fascist parties and leaders across Europe were becoming increasingly open about their hostility to the Church?

---

[1] P. Franziskus Stratmann O.P., "Carl Schmitts *Begriff des Politischen*," *Der Friedenskämpfer* 4, 6 (June 1928), 1-7, here 1.

[2] "Der Papst über die katholische Aktion," *Neue Freie Presse* No. 24988 (8 April 1934), 5.

[3] François to Fessard, 28 May 1937; Fessard to François, 31 May 1937, Fonds Fessard, Box 1, Folder 10.

This chapter is dedicated to answering these questions and explaining Fessard's response to François. The answer is not as simple as it might seem: although Catholic antipathy to Bolshevism was nothing new, Fessard's negative response relied on a new conceptual vocabulary, designed to legitimate Catholic anti-Communism in a newly-polarized age in which the Church's traditional conservative positions had either disappeared or become irrelevant. To see how this happened, this chapter will focus on one cluster of Catholic intellectuals, whom I'll call the "civil society Catholics." It is misleading to refer to them as "progressive" or "democratic," as other historians have done. The characteristic stance of these Catholics was not principled political activity at all, much less theoretical defense of parliamentary democracy. Instead, they retreated from politics altogether, insofar as "politics" refers to specific, partisan commitments to governing institutions and social programs (i.e. specific policies, specific values, specific political forms). "Political plans do not, as such, interest M. Maritain," wrote Joseph Desclausais in a critical *Revue Universelle* article. "He is only interested in spiritual ones."[4]

In addition to Fessard's and Maritain's circle of French Catholics, this chapter will focus on their allies among the German exile population, most prominently Waldemar Gurian and Paul-Ludwig Landsberg. Both of them ended up in Switzerland, which provided a congenial home for exiled Catholic anti-fascists for at least a part of the 1930s (the more corporatist exiles tended towards Austria, and will be discussed in the next chapter).[5] They were joined by, among others, Karl Thieme, a Catholic convert and close friend of Gurian's. Joseph Wirth, the former Chancellor and leader of the Catholic *Zentrum* party, was an active presence in Swiss exile life—organizing an

[4] Joseph Desclausais, "Primauté de l'Être," *Revue Universelle* 65 (1936), 641-65, here 655, 658. For Maritain's wrath, see the "Affaire Joseph Desclausais," Fonds Henri Massis, Bibliothèque Nationale Française, NAF25257, folios 168-89.

[5] It was, however, not kind to exiles overall. See Regula Ludi, "Dwindling Options: Seeking Asylum in Switzerland, 1933-1939," in *Refugees from Nazi Germany and the Liberal European States*, ed. Frank Caestecker and Bob Moore (New York, 2010), 82-102.

anti-racist manifesto that Gurian and Thieme wrote together—before coming to Switzerland himself in 1939. They found a publishing home with Carl Doka, the editor of *Schweizerische Rundschau,* who had longstanding connections with Rhenish Catholicism.[6] Switzerland was also home to Vita Nova Verlag, an anti-Nazi publisher that published Gurian, Maritain, and other Catholics in this tradition.

The most famous position held by this cluster of Catholics was their opposition to the Spanish Civil War: all four of the Catholics to be discussed in this chapter—Maritain, Gurian, Landsberg, and Fessard—were opposed to it. Landsberg lived in Spain and saw the violence firsthand, while Gurian engaged in furious polemics with his new colleagues at Notre Dame about the issue. Maritain wrote a preface decrying the notion of the "holy war," about which Fessard wrote in *Études*, the prestigious journal he edited (Maritain recognized the danger Fessard was courting, and wrote a letter of effusive thanks).[7] This placed them firmly in the minority of Catholic Europe. Their "opposition" to the war, however, did not extend to a commitment to one side or the other. Most Catholics and the vast majority of the hierarchy supported Franco's rebellions. Civil-society Catholics did not support the Republic, nor did their argumentative strategies involve a defense of its legitimacy. Instead, they were critical of both sides and simply wished the whole thing would draw to a close with as little bloodshed as possible. In their 1937 manifesto on this topic, *Pour le peuple basque*, they attacked the killing of noncombatants: "Under such conditions it is up to Catholics, without distinction of party, to be the first to raise their voices so that the world might be

[6] He wrote articles in favor of the League of Nations in the Platz's *Abendland* in the late 1920s. Also, as Gurian reported to Thieme, Doka was active in organizing material assistance for the emigrés. Gurian to Thieme, 15 September 1934, Nachlaß Thieme, Folder 163/28.

[7] Maritain to Fessard, 6 Janaury 1938, Fonds Fessard, Box 52, Folder Ma. For the review itself, in which Fessard particularly praises the bravery of Maritain's preface, see Fessard, [Review of Alfred Mendizabal, *Aux Origines d'une Tragédie*], *Études* 233 (1937), 824-5. Fessard also defended Mauriac and the other signers of *Pour le peuple basque*—the manifesto against atrocities in Spain—in a letter to Jean Wahl, 16 July 1937, Fonds Fessard, Box 53, Folder WZ, and he went to Maritain's house in Meudon to hear Bernanos speak about the same subject. Fessard to Lubac, 5 July 1937, Fonds Fessard, Box 73, Folder 2.

spared the pitiless massacre of a Christian people […] We address an anguished appeal to all men of good will, to all countries, that the massacre of noncombatants cease immediately."[8]

Despite the historiographical consensus, this war was not an especially important moment in French Catholic intellectual life, let alone European Catholic intellectual life (emigrés in Austria and Switzerland had far graver concerns). In *La Vie Intellectuelle*, the most important organ for those Catholics to be discussed in this chapter, there were few articles on Spain—there were far more articles on Russia, for instance, and about as many articles on Mexico.[9] The key moves had been already made in 1934 and 1935, in response to the Stavisky riots and the Abyssinian invasion: the two manifestoes *Pour le bien commun* (1934) and *Manifeste pour le justice et le paix* (1935), Gurian's *Bolschewismus als Weltgefahr* (1935), Gaston Fessard's *Pax Nostra* (1936), and Maritain's *Humanisme Intégral* (1936) (based on lectures delivered in 1934). The Spanish Civil War was their most public moment, but not the one that formed them.

The most significant years in the development of this Catholicism within the limits of civil society was 1934-6, and I will thus focus on those years (although not dogmatically). Our four guiding figures will be Waldemar Gurian, Paul-Ludwig Landsberg, Jacques Maritain, and Gaston Fessard. They all knew one another, with the exception, so far as I can tell, of Gurian and Fessard (although they were aware of one another's work[10]). Fessard was close with Gurian's friends, Maritain and Landsberg: indeed, before perishing at Oranienburg in 1944, Landsberg was planning

---

[8] "Pour le peuple basque," in Maritain, *Oeuvres Complètes* VI, 1130.

[9] Significantly, in Bernard Doering's article on the topic, he has to dance around the fact that Maritain wrote vanishingly little about the Spanish Civil War, and he quotes very few French right-wing articles on Spain, for the simple reason that there were not a great number of them. Doering, "Jacques Maritain, and the Spanish Civil War," *The Review of Politics* 4, 4 (1982), 489-522. Likewise, in Jay Corrin's account of this in Chapter 13 of *Catholic Intellectuals and the Challenge of Democracy*, he discusses primarily English Catholic supporters of Franco.

[10] Fessard relies on Gurian's work on Bolshevism in *La main tendue?* (Paris, 1937), 165, while Gurian wrote a praiseworthy review of "the well-known Jesuit, Father G. Fessard" and his own writings on Communism in 1947. Gurian, "Communism in France and Russia," *The Review of Politics* 9, 1 (January 1947), 112-15, here 112.

to officially convert to Catholicism under Fessard's guidance.[11] Landsberg met Maritain and Fessard in the 1930s: he attended study sessions at Meudon in 1934, and took part in a group interview about Maritain's *Humanisme Intégral*, along with Fessard, in 1937.[12]

Although the Swiss exiles were important, the geographical center of this chapter will be France: Gurian and Landsberg primarily mattered in the mid-1930s because of their impact on French intellectual life. The most important source will be the series of journals edited by Father Vincent Bernadot: *La Vie Intellectuelle* (founded 1928), *Sept* (1934-7), and *Temps Présent* (1937-9). All four of our major figures published in these journals, participating in, as Maritain wrote in a letter about *Temps Présent*, "a generosity effectively superior to partisan frontiers."[13] This constituted the most important set of periodicals for those Catholics who, after 1926, abandoned their Maurrasean sympathies and sought a new path for the faith; Bernadot himself, it should be noted, was one of the co-authors, with Maritain, of French Catholicism's most authoritative condemnation of Maurras from a doctrinal point of view, *Clairvoyance de Rome* (1929). I will also draw on Emmanuel Mounier's *Esprit*, which was a rogue force in the 1930s and does not fit precisely into the "civil society" rubric I've set up (Mounier signed a truly anti-fascist manifesto, for instance, studiously ignored by Maritain and other civil-society Catholics). It did, however, provide a platform for the civil society writings of Maritain and Landsberg, and was an important defender of the new language of personalism even if, as I will argue below, its contribution in this regard has been overstated.[14]

---

[11] John Oesterreicher, *Walls are Crumbling* (New York, 1952), 254.

[12] See their correspondence at the Maritain Archives. For his attendance at a study session, at which Simon was speaking, see Maritain and Simon, *Correspondance*, ed. Florian Michel (Tours, 2008), 195.

[13] Maritain to Marc, 26 December 1937, Fonds Alexandre Marc, Folder AM-120, Historical Archives of the European Union, European Institute, Florence.

[14] For more on Mounier's complex political itinerary, see Chapter 7.

I should note, also, a disciplinary shift in these writers: they did not identify as Catholic social scientists in the way that many of the figures from Part One had done. The reasons for this should be apparent: these authors asserted that Catholicism was primarily a spiritual affair and would only obliquely impact the fundamentally secular world of civil society. Civil-society Catholics did, however, further the *critique* of the secular sciences that we've seen developing in earlier decades. "In my view," Maritain declared in an important 1935 interview, "the solution would consist in distinguishing here the spiritual and the 'sociological' order, purifying the former of the latter"[15] (significantly, Maritain drew precisely upon Scheler to make that point). Gurian similarly railed against the "sociologization [Soziologierung] of the world."[16] This will be a chapter on theologians and philosophers, not one of sociologists and economists. Catholic social scientists, properly speaking, tended towards the corporatist Catholicism to be covered in the next chapter.

This chapter has four sections. The first will trace the contours of civil-society Catholicism as a transnational project, focusing on its constitution in the years around 1930. I will then turn to the mid-1930s, showing how "civil-society" Catholics interacted with the political crises of the time, following the lead of the Vatican and the "Catholic Action" movement. In the final two sections, I will focus on "personalism" and "anti-totalitarianism" in some philosophical detail, returning to my exemplary figures for some insight into the constellation of ideas that made up transnational, civil-society Catholicism.

Transnational Formation

After remaining in splendid isolation in the early 1920s crisis, French and Rhenish circles began to intermingle in the late 1920s: "Vive l'Internationale," as Fessard wryly commented upon

[15] "André Gide et notre temps," *Union pour la vérité* 42, 7-8 (April-May 1935), 254-323, here 292.

[16] Gurian, "Der Vater des Bolschewismus und Faschismus? Aus Anlaß der deutschen Sorel-Ausgabe," *Rhein-Mainische Volkszeitung* 59, 189 (16 August 1929), 4.

his own considerable ties to Germany.[17] The backdrop for this was the new atmosphere of trust in international order that surged through Europe in the latter half of the 1920s. While the much-ballyhooed Kellogg-Briand Pact was the most memorable expression of this new sensibility, there were also non-utopian reasons for optimism. This was the era of Briand, Stresemann, and Locarno, not Clemenceau, Eisner, and Versailles; the era of relative economic stability, and not the crushing burdens of the crisis-ridden early 1920s. Threats to the republican order—in the form of *völkisch* parties in Germany or the Action Française in France—were in abeyance until the economic crisis returned.[18]

Other scholars have, of course, noticed the transnational bent of 1930s Catholicism as compared to its relatively blinkered, nationalist counterpart in the 1920s. These previous accounts, however, have been tied to the same improper understanding of 1930s Catholicism as most other scholarship (i.e. that Catholics were either "Democrats" or "Fascists"). On the one hand, Jean-Claude Delbreil and Wolfram Kaiser represent those whare most interested in the the Christian-Democratic Secrétariat International des Partis Démocratiques d'inspiration chrétienne [SIPDIC]. They see it as a predecessor to Christian-Democratic internationalism, even while Delbreil at least (and Guido Müller, in an essay appearing in a collection edited by Kaiser) admits that SIPDIC was a highly marginal phenomenon. [19] On the other hand, scholars like John Hellman are interested in

[17] Fessard to Lubac, 10 April 1930, Fonds Fessard, Folder 73/B.

[18] Indeed Maurras theorized at the time that this new moment in European order was the true reason for his condemnation, and, as Jacques Prévotat has argued, hindsight shows that there is at least a shred of truth to this.

[19] Delbreil, *Les catholiques française et les tentatives de rapprochement franco-allemand* , 227; Kaiser, *Christian Democracy and the Origins of European Union*; Müller, "The Anticipated Exile of Catholic Democrats: The Secrétariat International des Parties Démocratiques d'Inspiration Chrétienne," *op. cit.*

Catholics *qua* Fascists, and he ends up tracing equally insignificant phenomena like the personal travel itinerary of Emmanuel Mounier.[20]

Both of these literatures are unsatisfactory, reducing a massive international organization to a few conferences and correspondents. In the next two chapters, I will try to trace more robust forms of transnational sensibility—ones that would more directly bleed into the incontrovertibly cosmopolitan sensibilities of Christian Democrats in the 1940s. Catholicism *was* deeply transnational at the time, and not merely because a handful of intellectuals hosted conferences: Catholic Action consisted of a global network of studiously apolitical organizations, linked in various ways to the clergy and thus to the Vatican. These groups provided the social-political backdrop to the "civil-society Catholicism" to be discussed in this chapter: they have, I think, been widely ignored because they are so difficult to fit onto the "democratic vs. fascist" continuum. For example, Jacques Maritain enjoyed an international vogue in the 1930s. He is usually lumped as a "democrat," but he wanted nothing to do with Christian Democratic parties and thus was alienated from SIPDIC (he was highly critical of the *Zentrum*). As he was clearly not a fascist, he disappears in the literature on transnational Catholicism (except for those works detailing his influence in Latin America). On the other hand, while there were relatively few genuine Catholic Fascists, Catholic corporatism, as social science and as political practice, exploded across Europe in the 1930s (this will be covered in the next chapter). The issue here is not that previous accounts are wrong: Kaiser, for instance, does provide important insight into the formation of the elite *Nouvelles Equipes Internationales*. I am interested, though, in the formation of political cultures more broadly, and for insight here we need to look at a broader source base, and think more seriously about the Church as a transnational institution serving millions of parishioners, than has been done in the literature thus far.

[20] John Hellman, *The Communitarian Third Way* (Montreal, 2002).

One form of transnational activism that arose during the 1930s concerned the issue of anti-Semitism. This issue cut across the corporatist/civil-society divide, bringing together figures as diverse as Maritain and Dietrich von Hildebrand. The center of this network was Johannes Oesterreicher, a Moravian priest living in Vienna, and his journal *Die Erfüllung*. Inspired by Joseph Wirth, Oesterreicher, Gurian, and Karl Thieme worked together on a manifesto that drew support from across the Catholic world: Austrian corporatists, Belgian social Catholics, French theologians, and more signed.[21] I will not be focusing on this strand of transnational activisim: as with the Christian-Democratic transnationalism, it was important in its own way, but it does not seem to me the central narrative. It was, though, part of the ferment of international Catholic activity during these years.

So, to return to our narrative: around 1930, a clutch of new Catholic journals appeared, giving voice to this new internationalist sensibility. In addition to *Abendland* (German, founded 1925), discussed briefly in Chapter 3, we could think of *La Vie Intellectuelle* (French, founded 1928), *Nova et Vetera* (Swiss, founded 1925), or *La Cité Chrétienne* (Belgian, founded 1926). *Abendland*, like most of these new journals, was closely linked to the politics of Locarno, which it trumpeted in its pages.[22] It was not, however, a liberal democratic journal: it believed that the new international cooperation should be in the spirit of medievalist Christian *Abendland*, not Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence (not for nothing was Ignaz Seipel on its board, or did the Austrian Friedrich Schreyvogl, who would become a Nazi sympathizer, serve as editor). "The name *Abendland*," the Catholic historian Alois Dempf wrote to Carl Schmitt, "binds us to a rejection of humanitarian

[21] John Connelly, "Catholic Racism and Its Opponents," *Journal of Modern History* 79:4 (December 2007), 813-847

[22] See, for instance, Hugo Lerchenfeld [former Prime Minister of Bavaria], "Locarno," *Abendland* 1, 4 (1926), 99-103.

liberalism and the ideology of the majority."[23] That said, the journal still participated in the new international spirit. Hermann Platz wrote reports of French Catholic congresses devoted to international peace, while Gurian covered the judgment of the *Action Française* and the new school of anti-Maurras Catholics growing around Maritain. [24]An article by Josef Karl Mayr, which appeared there in 1927, gives the flavor of this new sensibility.

> When we compare the Europe of today with that of ten years ago, we find an astonishing, and surprisingly rapid, change from a state of the deepest division and bloodiest self-laceration to one of purposeful cooperation and common rebuilding.[25]

Specifically, he believed that this turnaround, prefigured by the 1924 Dawes Plan, began in earnest in 1925, with Locarno and the withdrawal of Franco-Belgian forces from the Ruhr: the "neutralization of the Rhineland" had been the catalyst for "the hour of change of Western politics."[26] Gurian would bring the spirit and sensibility of these 1920s journals into the 1930s, in exile. Alongside his friend, Karl Thieme, Gurian published *Deutsche Briefe*, a small but influential journal dedicated to exposing National Socialist attacks on the church. One of its subscribers was Robert d'Harcourt, a Catholic who wrote lengthily and often about the National Socialist menace and its anti-Christian principles.[27]

The French periodical world responded in kind: indeed, it had a longer hill to climb, as anti-French sentiment had never been as fundamental to German Catholic identity as anti-German

---

[23] Dempf to Schmitt, 28 December 1925, Nachlaß Carl Schmitt, RSW 265 2820.

[24] Platz, "Bierville," *Abendland* 2, 1 (October 1926), 101-2; Gurian, "Ein Papstbrief gegen die Action Française," *Abendland* 2, 2 (November 1926), 48-9; Gurian, "Welt und Kirche," *Abendland* 2, 12 (September 1927), 362-6.

[25] Mayr, "Osteuropa als Glied der abendländischen Völkergemeinschaft," *Abendland* 3, 3 (December 1927), 78-81, here 78.

[26] Ibid., 79.

[27] On d'Harcourt, see Jean Chaunu, *Esquisse d'un jugement chrétien du nazisme* (Paris, 2007), in which he is, along with René Pinon, one of two major players. For his subscription to *Deutsche Briefe*, see d'Harcourt to Gurian, 17 June 1935, Gurian Papers, Box 4, Folder 10.

animus had been to the French. The first issue of *La Vie Intellectuelle* (1928) marks the shift. It includes an article from Karl Eschweiler about Max Scheler, reprints the lecture Maritain had recently given at a Tagung of the *Katholische Akademikerverband* in Constance, and includes a laudatory account by Joseph Delos about that same international event. "More than ever," Delos judged, "an international collaboration of intellectual Catholic forces is necessary."[28] And the version of Germany that they provided to the French was precisely the Rhenish one: in addition to Eschweiler, Bernadot's journal published Landsberg, Gurian, Peter Wust, Erik Peterson and Franziskus Stratmann, the founder of the Friedensbund Deutscher Katholiken, while ignoring even the most famous exemplars of Romantic Mitteleuropa.[29] In 1930, Robert d'Harcourt published account of a visit to Peter Wust, Fessard's teacher and Scheler's student, who was pointedly referred to in the title of the article as a "Rhenish philosopher." Both Wust and his visitor understood themselves to be building bridges not between Germany and France, but rather between Cologne and Paris: "these two cities where Thomas Aquinas taught."[30] In a review of one of Landsberg's books, André George claimed it was no surprise that Landsberg had come from the Rhineland, "that double culture where Germany and France are reconnected by the spirit of reconciliation."[31]

---

[28] Delos, "L'unité de l'Occident et l'association des universitaires catholiques allemands," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 1, 1 (October 1928), 75-86. Maritain had, a friend reported to Gurian, proved something of a disappointment to the Germans and had beeen guilty of "unbürgerliche Auftreten." The significance, of course, being that the German Catholics in attendance had been excited enough about Maritain to risk disappointment. Paul Adams to Gurian, 6 October 1928, Gurian Papers, Box 1, Folder 3. Another article from the Konstanz Tagung was published in the second issue: G. Schnürer, "L'Église et la civilisation occidentale," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 1, 2 (November 1928), 232-58.

[29] Stratmann split his time between Bonn and Berlin, but his journal, *Der Friedenskämpfer*, was edited by Walter Dirks and headquartered in Frankfurt.

[30] Robert d'Harcourt, "Un philosophe rhénan," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 7, 2 (May 1930), 226-233, here 233. There were also plans to create a "French institute" in Köln, spearheaded by Adenauer. On this project, see Jean de Pange to Peter Wust, 14 March 1930, in Peter Wust, *Deutsch-Französische Gesprach*, ed. Johannes Bendiek and Hildebert A. Hüning (Münster, 1968), 144-7, here 146.

[31] André George, "Sur l'Expérience de la Mort," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 44, 2 (25 July-25 August 36), 189-90, here 189.

It is not that Rhenish Catholics simply outnumbered their southern or Austrian counterparts in these journals: the reception of German Catholics was divided along strictly partisan lines in France. A 1934 article in *La Vie Intellectuelle* made this especially explicit, arguing that the Rhineland had the more authentic Christian federalist tradition than Bavaria, which was convulsed by a "nationalist fever."[32] *Documents de La Vie Intellectuelle* also published the results of a 1931 Franco-German Catholic congress, featuring Alois Dempf and Hermann Platz—two of the most stridently Rhenish Catholic voices in Germany.[33] This continued into the 1930s: one of Mounier's favored journalistic outlets in the late 1930s was *Die Zukunft*, a German exile journal run by Catholics from the old *Rhein-Mainische Volkszeitung* circle, including Landsberg.[34]

Let's look at the transnational formations of our four paradigmatic intellectuals, keeping in mind that it would be nearly impossible to come up with similar figures for the 1920s. We'll begin with the two new entries into our story: Fessard and Landsberg. Gaston Fessard will now become a central figure for the rest of the dissertation: born in 1897, he entered the Jesuit order in 1913, only to be called up almost immediately for military service. He spent the 1920s studying philosophy and law, and discovering the works of Hegel—which he happened across on a stroll through Munich—which were at the time essentially ignored in a France still dominated by Léon Brunschvicg's neo-Kantianism. After finishing up his preparation as a Jesuit with a year abroad in Münster in 1930, where he studied with Peter Wust and encountered Scheler's phenomenology, he moved to Paris. As editor of *Études*, he would become a significant figure in Parisian intellectual life for the next thirty years, particularly in the 1940s, when he would become the Catholic face of the Resistance and a,

---

[32] Charles Bosson, "Vers une Allemagne une et indivisible?" *La Vie Intellectuelle* 26, 3 (February 1934), 412-23, here 413

[33] *Les Documents* X, 3 (20 March 1932).

[34] See Keller, *Deutsch-französische Dritte-Weg-Diskurse* (München, 2001), 312ff.

perhaps *the*, major Catholic anti-Communist voice in the central debates about tripartisme in 1946-7 (for which see Part III).

Paul-Ludwig Landsberg came out of Gurian's circle in the Rhineland. Also Jewish, he was born in Bonn in 1901 to a respected academic family. After flirting with Communism in his youth, he fell into Catholic circles, largely through the influence of Scheler, in the early 1920s.[35] Gurian and Landsberg spent the 1920s in the Catholic youth movements together, hiking across the Rhenish countryside in sandals and reading Schmitt's works in the forest.[36] He maintained his position in Bonn until 1933, publishing very little (according to John Oesterreicher, he was undergoing a crisis of faith at the time[37]). When Hitler came to power, Landsberg immediately went into exile—he first followed his Rhenish friends to Switzerland, before making his way to Spain, where he would teach until the ravages of the Spanish Civil War forced him to Paris in 1936. From Spain he was in close contact with French intellectual life, particularly in the circles around Maritain, Mounier, and Jean Wahl (he likely met Maritain when the latter was in Spain in summer 1934 giving the lectures that

---

[35] The best biographical source for Gurian's life is Heinz Hürten's *Waldmar Gurian*, which will be my source unless otherwise noted. It is very much an "official" history, having been overseen by Edith Gurian, Waldemar's beloved wife, and published in the *Kommission für Zeitgeschichte* series, which is invested in a very particular understanding of German Catholic history. There are some serious errors of fact, particularly regarding the relationship between Gurian and Carl Schmitt. More importantly for this chapter, Hürten was not especially interested in Gurian's intellectual development or its deeper context. The best biographical source for Landsberg is John M. Oesterreicher, *Walls are Crumbling*, Chapter 5. This is quite short and non-scholarly, written as it was by a friend as a hagiography and not as a biography. Another source is Pierre Klossowski's introduction to the posthumous Paul-Ludwig Landsberg, "Les Sens spirituels chez Saint Augusinte," *Dieu Vivant* 11(1948) 83-105. I should note that Landsberg never technically converted to Catholicism; this is not as important as it might sound, as Landsberg was clearly operating as a Catholic intellectual in the sense described in my introduction: his interventions were uniformly in the Catholic public sphere both in the 1920s and 1930s (he was planning to convert before his untimely death in Oranienburg in 1944). In fact, Gurian sent the book to Maritain when the latter asked for samples of German Catholic intellectual production, even while noting that Landsberg was not, technically, a Catholic (Gurian to Maritain, 11 December 1925, Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim).

[36] This is not just a fanciful reconstruction on my part. See G. Grael to Gurian, 24 February 1948, Box 3, Folder 27, Gurian Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. (this letter mentions the sandals, hiking, and lectures); Landsberg to Schmitt, 23 August 1923, RSW 265 8625, Nachlaß Carl Schmitt (discussing his penchant to bring a copy of *Politische Romantik* into the woods with him).

[37] Oesterreicher, *Walls are Crumbling,* Chapter 5.

would become *Humanisme Intégral*).[38] He began writing for *Esprit* in 1934, from which point he became—according to Paul Ricoeur, another *Esprit* regular during these years—a dominant philosophical voice at the journal.[39]

Maritain, attuned as ever to the Zeitgeist, began to explore German Catholic life for the first time. "It increasingly seems impossible to ignore Catholic Germany, which does exist," he wrote to Massis in 1927. "There is," he added, "a very powerful Catholic movement among the youth." (recall Gurian's and Landsberg's involvement in the youth movements, which had a lower profile in Mitteleuropa.)[40] Between 1925 and 1927, Maritain ingratiated himself with a handful of Rhenish Catholics, most prominently Gurian, Wust, Eschweiler, Peterson, and Schmitt. With Eschweiler, a young admirer and spearhead of the first projects to translate Maritain into German, he attempted to turn his Meudon study circle into a model for a German renaissance.[41] The favor was returned: as Georg Moenius pointed out in a 1928 article in *Schönere Zukunft,* German Catholics were beginning to turn to Maritain *en masse* (even if Bernhard Jansen, one of Germany's premier Jesuits, acidly judged him a "thomiste extrême").[42] Gurian, who wrote a series of articles about Maritain in the late 1920s, paved the way by pointing out that Maritain "is not one of those polemical French writers […] who trace all evil back to German or Anglo-Saxon influence."[43]

---

[38] See Landsberg to Maritain, 16 July 1936, Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim.

[39] Ricoeur's judgment is cited in John Hellman, *The Communitarian Third Way*, 211. Heinrich Lutz has seconded this judgment. Lutz, *Demokratie im Zwielicht* (Munich, 1963), 22.

[40] Maritain to Massis, undated [1927], Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim.

[41] Mentioned in Eschweiler to Maritain, 20 May 1926, Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim.

[42] Moenius, "Jacques Maritain über Thomas von Aquin als 'Apostel unserer Zeit'", *Schönere Zukunft* 3, 39 (24 June 1928), 837-8. Jansen quoted in Fessard to Lubac, 1 August 1926, Fonds Fessard, Folder 73/B. Robert Grosche, incidentally, concurred with this judgment. Robert Grosche to Waldemar Gurian, 25 October 1926, Gurian Papers, Box 3, Folder 22.

[43] Gurian, "Jacques Maritain und der Neuthomismus," *Deutsh-Französische Rundschau* 1 (1928), 561-5, here 563.

In Maritain, Gurian had found his new muse. For various reasons, he had broken with his earlier mentors, and in Maritain Gurian found an intellectual lodestar that would guide him until his death in 1954. They first met in Paris around 1925, where Gurian was acting as a foreign-affairs correspondent for *Abendland*. He shared an apartment with Herbert Dankworth and Werner Becker, both of whom were also active at Platz's journal, and both of whom were active pro-Europeans like Gurian himself (Becker and Gurian published an interview with Lucien Romier, the editor of *Le Figaro*, in this vein[44]). In a series of articles for *Kölnische Volkszeitung, Rhein-Mainische Volkszeitung, Orplid,* and *Abendland*, he became Maritain's most important proponent in Germany, and it was through Gurian that Maritain met Peterson and Eschweiler.[45] In a remarkable series of letters in 1927, we can watch Gurian moving out of Schmitt's orbit and into Maritain's.[46]

Gurian and Maritain's new internationalist sensibility can be seen in their joint reaction to Henri Massis's *Défense de l'Occident* (1927). In this book, one of Maurras's most loyal lieutenants continues and amplifies the traditional Action Française critique of Germany, arguing that the West is once again in danger from the Prussian spirit, which had infiltrated Asia in the form of Bolshevism. "All these doctrines have, in fact, this in common, that they postulate at the outset the failure of Western culture, and that their aim is to bring about the decline of Latinity and its irremediable fall." Our only recourse is "the law of the rampart": we must, Massis counseled, entrench ourselves in Latinity.[47] These ideas, of course, were not at all foreign to Maritain; much of

---

[44] Gurian and Becker, "Deutschland und Frankreich im neuen Europa: Ein Gespräch mit Lucien Romier," *Abendland* 2, 6 (March 1927), 169-72.

[45] There first recorded contact is a letter from Gurian to Maritain in December 1925, Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim.

[46] The first public evidence of his rupture with Schmitt is probably Gurian's critique of "political theology" in Gurian, "Lamennais," *Die Schildgenossen* 7, 6 (November 1927), 499-517, 503. Gurian to Maritain, 18 September 1927 and 27 September 1927. Schmitt defended himself in a revelatory letter to Maritain the following year. Schmitt to Maritain, 24 December 1928. Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim.

[47] Henri Massis, *Defense of the West*, trans. F.S. Flint (New York, 1928), 162.

Massis's work could have been lifted from Maritain's WWI lecture series discussed in Chapter 1. But by 1927, things had changed. The switch, as Massis duly noted, was a rapid one: in the first draft of his *Une Opinion sur Charles Maurras,* which Maritain wrote in 1925 and sent to Massis for comment, he discussed "the invasion of Germanic ideas" which Maurras was laudably fighting. "There exists," Maritain wrote, "an inhuman Germanism which will never cease to agitate the world."[48] This was removed—not at Massis's suggestion!—for the 1926 publication. By the end of 1926, Maritain had turned on Maurras, who had gone too far by attacking the pope personally in his newspaper, and by the beginning of 1927 he had begun his lengthy feud with Massis.

Both Gurian and Maritain savaged Massis's work: Gurian publicly, through a review at *Abendland*, and Maritain privately, through a last-ditch effort to goad Massis into drastically revising, or even abandoning, the project. In his review, published in *Abendland*, Gurian begins by bringing Maurras to task for his continued unthinking anti-Germanism. Maurras and his associates, Gurian held, were guilty of "the attempt to secularize the Church and pursue political goals under cover of espousing the truths of revelation. And the work of Henri Massis […] is such an attempt."[49] Gurian argued that Massis was misrepresenting the nature of the Church by tying it to "the West," which meant, essentially, France: Gurian titled his review, "The Ideology of the West as a Mask for French Nationalism." Maritain, for his part, chided Massis that he could not possibly speak of "the Orient" or "German philosophy" as though they were stable entities (Massis's charge of hypocrisy on this

[48] Draft of "Une Opinion sur Charles Maurras," dated 1925, in Fonds Henri Massis, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, NAF25257.

[49] Gurian, "Die Abendlandideologie als Maske des französischen Nationalismus," *Abendland* 2, 9 (June 1927), 277-9, here 278.

point seems well-founded), and that the book would do more than inflame passions around the world.[50] "Our culture is Greco-Latin," Maritain wrote to his former friend. "Our religion is not."[51]

Catholic Action in Context

So, in the early 1930s the Franco-German barriers had largely come down amongst civil-society Catholics: even outside the marginal circles of Christian Democrats, Catholics were reading one another and seeking to move beyond the kneejerk xenophobia we saw in the early 1920s. This was not happening only in transnational conference, although it was happening there, too: more importantly, it was happening in the mass-circulation periodicals that were structuring Catholic political culture. In this section, before describing in some detail the main ideas of civil-society Catholicism, I will explore the position that civil-society Catholics occupied in the political maelstrom of the 1930s. The civil-society Catholics, including those involved with Catholic Action, most typically defended political agnosticism—in the sense of avoiding political partisanship—while remaining especially worried about the rights of the Church in the face of Bolshevism and Nazism, both of whose anti-clerical excesses were being worriedly discussed throughout Catholic Europe.

Catholics had every reason to fear for the security of their religion in the mid-1930s, especially from 1934 onwards. From 1934 onwards, it became clear that Hitler had no intention of sticking to the terms of the Concordat; specifically, Hitler targeted Catholic Action, assassinating Erich Klausener (the movements German head) during the Night of the Long Knives. Waldemar Gurian's *Deutsche Briefe*, which had a handful of prominent French subscribers, loudly publicized Hitler's anti-ecclesiastical activities. Robert d'Harcourt and René Pinon, above all, kept the French Catholic press buzzing with news about Hitler's anti-clerical activities. François Perroux contributed

[50] Maritain to Massis, undated [1927], Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim.

[51] Maritain to Massis, 4 March 1927, Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim.

Les mythes hitlériens in 1935, while Louis Gillet followed with the widely-read *Rayons et ombres d'Allemagne* (1937). In addition to Gurian, a number of German émigrés contributed in the French press.[52]

In regards to Bolshevism, Catholic horror was nothing new.[53] Pius XI had been in Poland during the Polish-Soviet War, so he knew the existential fear of Communism firsthand. *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931) was outspoken in its anti-Communism, while remaining silent about Fascist or authoritarian politics. In the 1930s, fear of Communism became more pressing for Western Europeans: with the birth of the Popular Front, a second transnationalism was taking shape, which seemed equally as dangerous. The Front itself came into existence in 1934, just as news of Hitler's outrages were becoming known. The next year, its candidates began actually winning, just as the Franco-Soviet Treaty of Mutual Assistance was signed (three other central moments in Popular Front culture—the burial of Henri Barbusse, the commemoration of the death of Jean Jaurès, and the international Congress of Writers for the Defense of Culture—were soon to follow). These events were taken extremely seriously by Catholics in France and elsewhere: the Archbishop of Paris sent a letter to the religious orders instructing them to have their bags packed, and passport ready, in case of revolution.[54] *Sept* published three separate issues on the Soviet Union, and a long series of articles by Marc Scherer—later to become prominent in the MRP—about the absolute impossibility of any collaboration between Catholics and Communists.[55]

---

[52] This is based on Jean Chaunu, *Esquisse d'un jugement chrétien du nazisme*, part I.

[53] Paul Christophe, *1936: Les catholiques et le front populaire* (Paris, 1979); David Curtis, "True and False Modernity: Catholic and Communist Marxism in 1930s France," in *Catholicism, Politics, and Society in Twentieth-Century France*, op. cit., 73-95;

[54] Arthur Plaza, *From Christian Militants to Republican Renovators: The Third* Ralliement *of Catholics in Postwar France, 1944-1965* (Phd. Diss., New York University, 2008), 43.

[55] See Aline Coutrot, *Sept* (Paris, 1982), Part II, Chapter VI on *Sept*'s anti-Communist campaigns. The passionate nature of this period is brought out by the fact that, in 1952, Scherer's exaggerations were pardoned: they "ont l'excuse d'avoir

While the international scene looked dire for Catholicism, events within France were also at a fever pitch. The Stavisky riots of 1934 were the defining political event of the period, marking the final polarization of the country between National Front and Popular Front. In that year, in response to government scandal, right-leaning French citizens took to the streets and nearly brought down the Third Republic. The origins of the Popular Front can be located in the counter-demonstrations to these riots: in response to reactionary saber-rattling, socialists and Communists put aside their considerable differences and marched the streets under the battle cry, "L'Unite!"[56] "France was living through a moral and mental civil war," recalled one resident, and "one had to choose between fascism and fellow-traveling."[57] In other words, one had to choose between the Ligues and the Popular Front. Most Catholics opted for the corporatist, quasi-fascist Ligues, and their intellectual representatives will be the subject of the next chapter.

There was a space in between the two sides, and it was not merely occupied by cringing intellectuals longing for a third way. On the contrary, it was occupied by one of the most vital, if understudied, movements of the 1930s: Catholic Action. Catholic Action was meant as a replacement model for the outdated Catholic parties of the past. The PPI in Italy and the *Zentrum* were gone, the Christian Socials in Austria were folded into the "Fatherland Front," while France's Christian-Democratic parties (the left-wing *Jeune République* and the centrist *Parti Démocrate Populaire*) remained just as minor as Christian Democracy in France had always been. Civil-society Catholics, too, were skeptical of parties: Maritain is, therefore, critical of Christian confessional parties like the *Zentrum*, let alone nostalgic theocracy or even the fascist corporatism of Dollfuß and Pétain to be

---

été écrites en 1937." Benedetto Falcucci, "Tout est-il faux dans le communisme?" *Chronique sociale de France* 60, 4 (October 1952), 359-420, here 379.

[56] See Anson Rabinbach, "Paris, Capital of Anti-Fascism," *The Modernist Imagination*, ed. Warren Breckman, et al., (New York, 2009), 183-209, esp. 190-6 on this.

[57] Quoted ibid. 184.

described in the next chapter (Maritain was as critical of Dollfuss as he was of Blum[58]). He was not alone: an author in *Sept* was just as critical of Dollfuss for bringing out the Heimwehr, in particular, and for involving the Church in politics at all: "especially in politics," he chided, "the better can reveal itself as the enemy of the good."[59]

Catholic Action was not merely about providing Catholic youths with places to socialize, although it was that, too: Pius XI saw this dense network of institutions as the key to the Catholic reconquest of the social. Catholic Action was less *Ralliement* than it was *Quas Primas*, the 1925 encyclical proclaiming the reign of Christ on Earth. Indeed, it should understood in the context of other, simultaneous attempts to remake social life, most notably from Communist and Fascist groups.[60] Karl Muth, editor of *Hochland,* made precisely this point in 1929, championing Catholic Action against the "revolutionary movements" of Bolshevism and Fascism.[61] Consider Pius's formulation: "the organized participation of the laity in the hierarchical apostolate of the Church, transcending party politics, for the establishment of Christ's reign throughout the world." This is a brief for global domination, while also abjuring the traditional sphere of politics. Christ's reign was to come about through individual and spiritual transformation: consider the "Ten Commandments of Catholic Action," published in a Catholic journal in 1933. While nothing "political" in the everyday sense was commanded, a certain set of social obligations was certainly proscribed (moreso than in the Commandments' scriptural predecessor): "You will act with full confidence of your

[58] See, for instance, Jacques Maritain, "A propos de la répression des troubles de Vienne," *Oeuvres Complètes* V, 1020-1.

[59] Henri Simondet, "Le sort de l'Autriche," *Sept* 1, 1 (March 1934), 3-4.

[60] Albert C. O'Brien, "Italian Youth in Conflict: Catholic Action and Fascist Italy, 1929-1931," *Catholic Historical Review* 68 (1982), 625-35; Susan B. Whitney, *Mobilizing Youth: Communists and Catholics in Interwar France* (Durham, 2009).

[61] Karl Muth, "Epiphanie. Laiengedanken zur Katholische Aktion," *Hochland* 26, 1 (1929), 337-46, here 46.

responsibilities" (Commandment 4); "You will learn to remain in your position, especially if it is uncomfortable" (Commandment 6).[62]

While Catholic Action had technically been founded by Pius X in 1905, it was under Pius XI's pontificate that it truly took off, primarily in the 1930s (even in Italy).[63] In Belgium, the major organization was the *Association catholique de la jeunesse belge*: their 1931 conference had 100,000 attendees. In Austria, too, as Laura Gellott has shown, Catholic Action was a phenomenon of the 1930s, and it was far less congenial to the Christian Socials than we might think.[64] It was less successful in Germany, given the close ties that existed between Catholic civil-society organizations and the *Zentrum*.[65]It did exist, though, and one of its leaders was the Rhenish jurist, Karl Neundörfer, who published multiple essays on the topic in the late 1920s. Throughout his work, which included detailed critiques of Church canon law, he emphasized above all that the Church must remain absolutely indifferent to political questions, pointing out that "the democratic state form is, in certain conditions, the best."[66]

In France, Catholic Action had a long history: L'association catholique de la jeunesse française was the main movement, and it had 600,000 members by the late 1930s. The Jeunesse ouvrière chrétienne, founded in 1927, has 22,000 members by 1933 and 150,000 by 1943. Its female equivalent, the JOCF, founded in 1928, had 50,000 members by 1939. In June 1936, 50,000

---

[62] "Les dix commandements de l'Action catholique," *La vie au patronage* 17 (1933), 416.

[63] Paul Misner, "Catholic Labor and Catholic Action: The Italian Context of 'Quadragesimo Anno'," *Catholic Historical Review* 90 (2004) 650-74, 656.

[64] Laura Gellott, "Defending Catholic Interests in the Christian State: The Role of Catholic Action in Austria, 1933-1938."

[65] Heinz Hürten, *Deutsche Katholiken 1918-1945*, 133-7.

[66] Karl Neundörfer, "Politische Form und religiöser Glaube: Eine Bücherbescprechung," *Die Schildgenossen* 5, 4 (July 1925), 323-31, here 327. For his writing on canon law, see Neundörfer, "Recht und Macht in der Kirche," Ernst Michel, ed., *Kirche und Wirklichkeit* (Jena, 1923), 52-63.

Catholics appeared in a Paris soccer stadium to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the ACJF. French Catholic Action participated very much in the apolitical Catholicism outlined here: in response to the Stavisky riots, for instance, the ACJF made it clear that they could take a stance, and they advised their members to steer clear of explicit politicizing.[67]

Catholic Action operated in tandem with the new political sensibilities I'm charting in this chapter. Maritain, for instance, mattered here: Martin Conway, one of few people who has studied Catholic Action in any serious detail, has declared him the "quasi-official philosopher" of Catholic Action.[68] J.T. Delos, a social Catholic active in the *Semaines Sociales*, praised Catholic Action in *La Vie Intellectuelle* in 1935. Its goal, he declared, was to "ensure that the temporal social order is Christian and sanctified for the souls who dwell in it." This might sound "political," but it is not, especially not in the context of the 1930s, when Communism and Nazism loomed. In a section on the totalitarian state, Delos claimed, "The problem is not at all political, but philosophical and sociological." An anonymous article in the same journal the following year suggested Catholic Action as an explicit antidote to Communism. The journals I'm looking at were widely circulated: special numbers of *Sept*, for instance, ran to 100,000 copies.[69]

The civil-society Catholics were, that is, the political-cultural voice of Catholic Action, and like them they refused to take a position in the heady events of 1934, uttering what they called a "double no." As Fessard wrote to a friend in the wake of the riots, neither the right nor left could be trusted. Even *Esprit*, which was more open to socialism than most other Catholic organs, remained

---

[67] Arthur Plaza, *From Christian Militants to Republican Renovators,* appendix for these statistics, page 15 for a description of the 1936 rally.

[68] Martin Conway, "Building the Christian City: Catholics and Politics in Interwar Francophone Belgium," 126.

[69] J.T. Delos, "Pour un ordre catholique," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 34, 1 (25 February 1935), 44-47, here 45; Anonymous, "Communistes et catholiques," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 42, 3 (10 May 1936), 402-4; Chaunu, *Esquisse* 21n.

wary of the "two categorical misunderstandings" that dominated French politics.[70] Yves Simon summed up this attitude when he referred to politics as a "seductive and necessary hell."[71] Like the Catholic hell, Simon suggests, the political is defined by the absence of God. But, also like the Catholic hell, the boundaries and contours of politics are divinely ordained: hell is that place ruled by God, despite or even because of his absence.

The best barometer of civil society Catholicism was an anonymous priest who published as "Christianus" and served as the editorial voice of *La Vie Intellectuelle*, the movement's central organ throughout much of the 1930s.[72] Christianus believed the riots to be evidence of serious problems in the French state, but that the Catholic must not take sides on the issue, as many in the Ligues had been doing. "Historical circumstances," he warned, "have created, in our country, an inextricable confusion between religion and politics."[73] He later emphasized this in an editorial called "Christianisme d'abord," whose title was a clear reference to Maurras's famous slogan, "Politique, d'abord." Some Catholics, Christianus writes, have called for commitment to one side or the other, while some have called for complete disengagement. But we must do both: "Neither impurity nor desertion, we say: is there not a poignant contradiction at the heart of the Christian? We believe, on the contrary, that these are two aspects of the same tendency."[74] The impure sphere of politics, he

---

[70] --, "Notre Humanisme," *Esprit* 37 (October 1935), 1-25, here 2.

[71] "A droite, des gens qui défendent leur porte-monnaie, à gauche des gens qui défendent leur situation électorale qui est une autre sorte de porte-monnaie!" Fessard to Lubac, 1 April 1934, Fonds Fessard, Folder 73/C. The Simon quotation is from a May 1934 letter to Maritain in Maritain and Simon, *Correspondance*, 171.

[72] He identifies himself as a priest in the unnamed article that opens up the first post-war issue of *La Vie Intellectuelle*. Christianus, [untitled], *La Vie Intellectuelle* 13, 1 (February 1945), 1-16, here 10. I assume here that Christianus had a stable identity.

[73] Christianus, "Les confusions mortelles," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 28, 2 (25 April 1934), 178-81, here 178.

[74] Christianus, "Christianisme d'abord," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 29, 1 (25 May 1934), 6-8, here 6.

suggests, can be leavened by the participation of the Christian, whose hands remain, somehow, clean.

The same position was staked out in *Pour le bien commun*, the lengthy manifesto that Maritain prepared in the wake of the Stavisky riots and which was signed by a prestigious list including Etienne Borne, Charles du Bos, Etienne Gilson, Louis Le Fur, and Emmanuel Mounier (Maritain mailed a copy to Gurian and asked him to publicize it in Germany[75]). It is easy to see why the manifesto's studied neutrality was so frustrating to the Catholic right. The main point is that Catholics cannot, *qua* Catholics, make a political commitment in the wake of the February riots: we must declare, the manifest announces, a "double no" to fascism and Bolshevism, each of which were seeking to violently reshape France in its own image. "We refuse to support either an error or its contrary," but at the same time we cannot remain silent, and must witness to the truths of Christianity.[76] The Church, the manifesto argued, does have a vision for a future society: the pluralist society sketched out in *Quadragesimo Anno*, Pius XI's 1931 encyclical. But this cannot be brought about through political action, as normally understood, especially in the absence of a viable Christian political party.[77] While holding out the hope that, at some point, a non-clerical party would be formed in the name of the true *bien commun*, the Catholic can now rely only on "poor means [moyens pauvres]": these means "are of spiritual order and the order of private life."[78]

---

[75] Maritain to Gurian, 10 May 1934, Maritain Archives, University of Notre Dame, CZAN, Folder 1. It was highly praised in *La Vie Intellectuelle*: L.B. "Pour le bien commun," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 29, 1 (25 May 1934), 80-3; Marc Scherer, "Lettre ouverte à M. Jacques Maritain," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 40, 1 (10 January 1936), 11-23. Here Scherer (later a prominent member of the MRP), reports that the declaration had convinced him that "good sense had not been abolished." (12) A similar position was laid out in *Sept*: "Incertitudes Catholiques," *Sept* 1, 5 (31 March 1934), 3.

[76] *Pour le Bien Commun* (Paris, 1934), 12. This "double no" was not a novelty in 1934; one can see it, for instance, in Civis, "L'État debile," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 20, 2 (10 March 1933), 210-2.

[77] *Pour le bien commun* 23. On the non-formation of a Christian political party in France, see the excellent account in Stathis Kalyvas, *The Rise of Christian Democracy in Europe* (Ithaca, 1996), Chapter 3.

[78] Ibid. 24. Maritain had introduced this concept in his *Du régime temporel et de la liberté* of the previous year

The manifesto outlined a complex relationship between religion and politics, arguing for neither strict separation nor theological-political unity.

> Religion and politics, while remaining distinct, must be vitally united: not by external or institutional alliances, as in the time of throne and altar: it is *in us* that the kingdom of God is to be found, it is in our heart and in our private life.[79]

Our first duty is to live a Christian and pure life, to serve as a missionary and a witness in the belief that, as Péguy had taught, "the revolution will be moral or it will not be at all." We must go beyond Constantine and back to Christ, whose witness was apostolic and not juridical. But at the same time, there should be "vital unity" between religion and politics, mediated not by mass parties but by our "heart" and our "private life": activities performed outside the purview of law, in the safe space of civil society.

As in the previous chapters, I want to emphasize that this had very little to do with "democracy." Glaringly absent from the list of signatories to *Pour le bien commun* were the most prominent Christian Democrats: Paul Archambault, Georges Bidault, Francisque Gay, and their house theologian, Maurice Blondel (in a letter to a fellow signatory, Maritain revealed that Blondel's refusal to sign was especially crushing[80]). The important point is that neither the manifesto, nor the journals which nurtured its sensibility, came out in favor of the republic: indeed, Christianus was at times skeptical of the Third Republic's legitimacy.[81] It is not the case, either, that the manifesto's opposition to the rioters was intended as an implicit support for the republic: in a simultaneous controversy with Paul Archambault, a true Christian democrat, Maritain made clear his contempt for parliamentary democracy, at least as practiced in France. George Shuster, the editor of *Commonweal*

---

[79] Ibid. 26.

[80] Maritain to Vialatoux, 16 May 1934, Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim.

[81] Christianus, "L'État serviteur," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 26, 3 (10 February 1934), 354-6.

and a friend of Gurian's at the time, recalled that the Gurian of the early 1930s "kept on insisting that [Josef Wirth] be called upon to establish a dictatorship."[82]

Sept, a prestigious Catholic journal founded the month after the Stavisky riots, was a perfect exemplar of this new sensibility. Although it ceaselessly covered political events, it was allergic to the political, as such. Its first issue featured an article called, simply, "Pas de politique," and claimed that the very idea of politics made them "queasy" [écoeuré]: "We say: Find above parties and outside of politics the point of junction between the true Christian spirit and the French people."[83]As in *Pour le bien commun*, theirs was a politics beyond politics. On the cover of the second issue, they celebrate their identity this way: "Neither right nor left, independent from politics in order to better serve the City."[84] This is a political independence that still seeks to serve the polity, and a retreat from politics that is inescapably political. In another navel-gazing article, *Sept* claimed that its goal was to "create a Catholic public opinion" in a way that "transcends political formations."[85] Later, Mauriac wrote in *Sept* that the conflict between duties to God and country was a "pseudo-conflict," and that, like Joan of Arc, if we serve God first, "we are assured of being, at the same time, good servants of France."[86] It goes without saying that *Sept* was not pro-democratic. As Étienne Gilson, one of its chief

---

[82] This is from the foreword that Shuster wrote to an interview of Josef Wirth that he conducted; Shuster, who edited *Commonweal* through much of the 1930s and went on to become military governor of Bavaria, was fluent in German and one of few Americans well-acquainted with European Catholic intellectual life. Shuster Collection, Box 3, Folder 21.

[83] "Pas de Politique" [anonymous]," *Sept* 1, 1 (3 March 1934), 14. Note, too, that "En dehors et au-dessus des partis" became the slogan of *Temps Présent*, the successor to *Sept*. This was also the sensibility of Étienne Gilson, *Sept*'s major political commentator. In "Pour l'Union des Catholiques de France," he called for a return to the spirit of early Christianity: "Ce n'est pas l'Etat qui nous aidera à fonder des foyers chrétines et à les faire vivre; ce n'est pas lui qui créera des conditions chrétiennes de vie et de travail […] En tout ceci, quels sont don nos modèles? Les premiers chrétiens." *Sept* 1, 33 (12 October 1934), 1. For more on early Christianity, see "Pour comprendre *Sept*," *Sept* 2, 52 (22 February 1935), 20. "[Q]uels sont donc nos modèles? Les premiers chrétiens! Nous sommes dans un monde païen, comme eux."

[84] Cover of *Sept* 1, 2 (10 March 34).

[85] "Pour comprendre *Sept*," 20.

[86] François Mauriac, "La conjuration des forces adverses," *Sept* 2, 90 (15 November 1935), 16.

ideologues, bluntly put it, *Sept* "is not a democratic journal"; he also criticized *l'Aube* specifically for making a concrete, pro-*democratic political commitment.*[87]

So if "democracy" was not the key term in civil-society Catholic discourse, what was it? As in the 1920s, Catholics were interested in broader social and economic themes. But while many Catholics turned towards corporatism as a full-fledged economic doctrine, the civil-society Catholics did not; they were more interested in what Maritain called "pluralism". They were interested, that is, in creating the sort of society in which Catholic Action could flourish—meaning that the state had to be weakened and the multivalent identity of the individual wrested away from "citizenship" and parcelled out into the multiple communities (gender, religion, class, family, profession) incarnated within Catholic Action. *Pour le bien commun*, in addition to providing a clear and early example of non-political politics, revives the old idea of the "human person" and combines it with the novelty of "anti-totalitarianism." It was pathbreaking in that it provides one of the first and most prominent introduction of these two terms, which would go on to underwrite Catholic political and social thought for decades, most prominently in the post-1945 moment.

The Person and the State in Fessard, Landsberg, and Maritain

Personalism and anti-totalitarianism: these, I contend, were the themes that dominated Catholic thinking in the 1930s, and would pave the path towards Catholic legitimation of post-1945 democracies. They were not the province of civil-society Catholics alone: as we'll see, their corporatist opponents were using the same language. By showing how both competing forms of transnational Catholicism were speaking the same political language, we will see how the relatively homogenous Catholicism of the Cold War was forged. In the rest of this chapter, I will explore

[87] "Notre position," *Sept* 3, 103 (14 February 1936), 4. "Sans doute, *L'Aube* est un organe d'inspiration chrétienne […] mais elle s'est délibérément située sur le terrain temporel; entre les moyens politiques, elle fait un libre choix. C'est précisément ce que, quant à nous, nous nous refusons à faire." The Gilson quote is embedded in this article, referring to an earlier Gilson article for *Sept*.

personalism and anti-totalitarianism as concepts, relating them backwards to the anti-étatiste political culture of the 1920s and showing how they spread throughout the Catholic public sphere in the 1930s.

We'll begin with the person. In Part One, we saw that in both France and the Rhineland the idea of the "person" had been mobilized in support of federalizing, anti-étatiste politics. After this brief 1920s vogue, however, the notion fell out of fashion. There was certainly no such thing as "personalism," a philosophy placing the notion of the person at its very center. Scheler had acquired the taint of heresy by this point; with the exception of Dietrich von Hildebrand (see Chapter 5), his Catholic students—Heinrich Getzeny, Paul Landsberg, Peter Wust—failed to put the term at the center of their reflections in the late 1920s.[88] Characteristically, Karl Eschweiler's lengthy 1928 appreciation of Scheler in *La Vie Intellectuelle* did not discuss his theories of the "person."[89] Maritain, too, almost entirely ignored the term between 1925 and 1933. The same is true of Landsberg, who wrote almost nothing in the interim period, and of Fessard, who did not come to the term at all until the mid-30s. Nonetheless, when it burst back onto the scene during the crisis years of 1933-6, the term retained the same political connotations it had had in the early 1920s: a principled anti-étatisme and critique of sovereignty. "The Christian philosophy of the city," declared Eugène Duthoit in 1933, "is the basis of 'personalism'."[90]

---

[88] Getzeny, *Vom Reich der Werte,* 149; Wust, *Crisis of the West*, trans. E.I. Watkin (London, 1927, 1930), does not use the term in any detail; in one of Landsberg's few publications in these years, he briefly mentions the person but it is far from the center of his reflections. Landsberg, "Philosophie und Kulturkrisis," *Die Schildgenossen* 10, 4 (July/August 1930), 308-19, here 313-4. In 1932, he finished a work on philosophical anthropology (unpublished until 1934): amazingly, the Person is not at all at the center of Landsberg's reflections. It would not return there until 1934. Landsberg, *Einführung in die philosophische Anthropologie* (Frankfurt, 1934). See page 8 for its 1932 publication.

[89] Karl Eschweiler, "En Allemagne: Max Scheler," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 1, 1 (October 1928), 112-22.

[90] Eugène Duthoit, "Politique et sens chrétien," in *La société politique et la pensée chrétienne* (Lyon, 1934), 27-72, here 52.

My contention will be that, although personalism was defined in a variety of philosophical languages, this was always in the service of a similar political project. "Personalism" did not fundamentally label a *philosophical* program, because, as we will see, it was defended in phenomenological, Thomist, and Hegelian language. Instead, it was a *political* program from the beginning, defended in a variety of philosophical languages. By 1936, Etienne Borne could write that "all of us who reflect […] have understood that every reconstruction of a Christian humanism and a Christian city must be carried out under the sign of the person."[91] This process of reflection took place in the mid-1930s, and in this section I will attempt to trace its contours.

If the "person" is really all about politics, the question remains: what *sort* of politics? At its most basic level, personalism teaches that the human person and his eternal soul can never be exhaustively contained in a political or social order, as a part of him always and necessarily belongs to God. This is more than platitudinous Christianity, although it often sounds like it. Christians had, of course, been arguing for centuries that salvation could not be found on earth, and that the kingdom of God was in heaven. The novelty here is that civil-society Catholics took this notion of the Christian subject and reintroduced it into the very sphere of politics they simultaneously denounced. The person is not exhausted in the political, but nonetheless Christians must inhabit the public sphere in a way that is not political, and even denies the category of sovereignty as such. What we see here is the eruption into politics of a moral voice that simultaneously disclaims the political in the name of the person. As one civil-society Catholic wrote in 1936, "The obsession with 'politics' does not, sadly, grant political wisdom."[92] Only through the denial of politics can the Catholic become political.

---

[91] Etienne Borne, "Destins de la Personne," *Sept* 3, 97 (3 January 1936), 5.

[92] ---, "Dieu est-il à droite?" *La Vie Intellectuelle* 41, 2 (10 March 1936), 219-45, here 223. Characteristically, the answer to this title question was no, but it is not the "no" of the Catholic left-ists at *Terre nouvelle*, but the "double no" of the civil-

Between 1933 and 1936, personalism burst back onto the scene. Arnaud and Dandieu's *La Révolution nécessaire* (1933) used it heavily (their earlier books had not done so), and the personalist journal *Ordre Nouveau* was founded that year. After avoiding the terminology for years, Maritain discussed personalism in his *Du régime temporel et de la liberté* (1933), while Duthoit, as we have seen, discussed the philosophy in his high-profile opening address at the *Semaines Sociales de France* in the summer of 1933. Mounier, who would grow to become personalism's most celebrated representative, was something of a late-comer: his journal did not seriously define or defend "personalism" until 1934, and the epochal special issue on the "Personalist Revolution" appeared in December of that year.[93] The first book-length account of personalist philosophy appeared in 1934 (by Denis de Rougemont, a Protestant in the *Ordre nouveau* circle), while the second, written from a Catholic perspective, appeared in 1935; Mounier published his own *Manifeste au service du personnalisme* in 1936.[94] It appeared in the *Pour le bien commun* manifesto of early 1934, and the political editorialist at *La Vie Intellectuelle* began to use personalist vocabulary in the same year; it became commonplace in the journal between 1934 and 1936, while Etienne Gilson began using it in its sister journal, *Sept*, in 1934.[95] It was a theme of international reflection, too; as Fessard reported, an international congress of Catholic intellectuals, held in Strasbourg in 1935, had the "person" as one of its major themes.[96] The 1934 *Semaines Sociales* had as its theme, "L'Éducation pour la personne."[97] By 1937,

---

society tradition of *Pour le bien commun*: God is neither right nor left. In the previous installment (41, 1 (25 Feb 36), 49-72, here 49), the author had declared, "The Church must not be enclosed in the barbed-wire fence of a party."

[93] The term shows up sporadically in 1933, but there are no full essays devoted to the notion until 1934.

[94] Denis de Rougemont, *Politique de la Personne* (Paris, 1934); Pierre-Henri Simon, *Destins de la Personne* (Paris, 1934).

[95] Civis, "Exigences du bien commun [note the title]," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 30, 2 (25 July 1934), 222-4, here 223. Gilson, "Intermède Soviétique," *Sept* 1, 11 (19 May 1934), 2. See also, for instance, J.T. Delos, "Pour un ordre catholique," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 31, 4 (25 February 1935), 44-47; D., "L'ordre corporatif et la conférence internationale de Vienne," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 36, 3 (25 June 1935), 491-8; Christianus, "Plans et doctrines," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 41, 2 (10 March 1936), 178-80.

[96] 26 October 1935, Fessard to Lubac, Fonds Fessard, Box 73, folder 2.

when the same series treated "La personne humaine en peril" as its theme, the concept had truly arrived and become the dominant Catholic understanding of the political subject. By 1939, Louis Cruvillier could, in a letter to Maritain, refer to the "classic distinction between the 'individual' and the 'person'."[98]

The "person" was almost uniformly introduced as part of a critique of nation-state sovereignty. This was true in both Catholic and non-Catholic invocations: in Aron and Dandieu's *La Révolution nécessaire*—widely read in Catholic circles—they claim that the "emancipation of the person" requires "the destruction of the State" and that the true danger facing modern civilization is not capitalism, as such, but "super-étatisme." "The new order," they conclude, "will be founded on a decentralization, as complete as possible."[99] In Duthoit's invocation of the term at the Semaines Sociales the same year, it is also employed against the servile state: "Many people expect everything from the state: secure old age, monitored health, education for children, stabilized prices; all of this without personal efforts, without sacrifices." This "economic étatisme" flies in the face of Catholic political theory which, as expressed in *Quadragesimo Anno* and elsewhere, embeds the person in a variety of communities, including the church and the family: this anti-étatiste pluralism, familiar from Part I, is called "personalism" by Duthoit.[100] Mounier's *Manifeste au service du personnalisme* was, essentially, a book-length screed against the state. "We are," Mounier laconically declared, "anti-étatistes." The state, for instance, should cede educational responsibility to the family, "because the State has no regard for personal life as such." In his discussion of "the cancer of the State at the

---

[97] For an account, see Pierre-Henri Simon, "L'éducation pour la personne," *Sept* 1, 23 (4 August 1934), 2. "Personnalisme n'est pas individualisme; c'est même en un sens le contraire."

[98] Louis Cruvillier to Maritain, 19 February 1939, Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim.

[99] Aron and Dandieu, *La Révolution nécessaire* (Paris, 1933), 5, 84, 275.

[100] Eugene Duthoit, "Politique et sens chrétien," 34, 37, 52.

very heart of our democracies," Mounier makes a fateful and characteristic linkage that will be the subject of the next section: "just as the river into the sea, democratic étatisme slides into the totalitarian state."[101]

The three most prominent and philosophically-interesting writers to develop personalist, anti-étatiste themes between 1934 and 1936 were Fessard, Landsberg, and Maritain (Gurian had never been philosophically inclined, and drops out of our story for the time being). We can begin with Landsberg who, recall, had been writing about *Personalismus* since the early 1920s as one of Scheler's most brilliant studentsLandsberg had been studiously apolitical in the 1920s. In the 1930s, though, he became more interested in problems of state, which had, after all, turned his own life upside-down. Although he did not sign any of civil society Catholicism's manifestoes—only French writers signed—he signaled his agreement with, for instance, their position on the Spanish Civil War in a letter to Maritain, and he wrote to Gurian praising his recent works on totalitarian and Bolshevism which were, as we'll see in the next section, central documents in this milieu.[102]

His first French essay, "Quelques réflexions sur l'idée chrétienne de la personne," which appeared in *Esprit* in December 1934, is a typical personalist reflection of the time. The bedrock belief of personalism, in Landsberg's estimation, is that there is "a central difference between each human individual and anything else that might, apparently, resemble it." Our personhood cannot be added to the complex of physical, or even psychological, characteristics, as though it were a contingent predicate and not the unique entity to which traits are later appended. He mobilizes an "existential" understanding of the person as a "totality" [une tout] against the Aristotelian

---

[101] Maritain, *Oeuvres Complètes* I, 618, 553, 614.

[102] Landsberg to Maritain, 31 October 1937, Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim. Landsberg to Gurian, 26 February 1936, Gurian Papers, Box 5, Folder 14. Landsberg was almost certainly referencing his article on Marx, which appeared in *La Vie Intellectuelle* in 1937.

understanding of the soul as a unique added feature that separates man from nature. In terms reminiscent of Heidegger, Landsberg claims that this existential fact is often forgotten because we quail from the responsibility of personhood: "to be a person, insofar as this is an activity, signifies a demand that man seeks to escape." We want to think ourselves as substances, capable of understanding through the static understanding of the sciences. For Landsberg, however, we can only be understood "as a process" and a "constant struggle."[103]

What, then, might a community of such unique entities look like? What are the politics of personality? As always in these circles, the answer is necessarily vague as the disavowal of politics is the paradoxical founding gesture of personalist politics. Landsberg describes an "empire of persons" in which national characteristics would be maintained—the nations "never resembled one another so much as during the great war"—while the personhood of each individual would be respected.[104] The only obvious concrete application of personalist politics in the essay is an opposition to Nazism and Marxism, both of which deny the absolute difference between man and man by laying the nation on the Procrustean beds of race or class: the only feature of the personalist community to come that Landsberg specifies is that it "opposes itself to the idea of a uniform collectivity, of an elite or popular mass as a product of directed hereditary selection [i.e. eugenics] or transformations of social milieu [i.e. class]."[105] While he did not devote major essays to Nazism—which was not, despite the sympathies of a sporadic few, a major political presence in France—he did write, for *La Vie Intellectuelle*, an essay on Marxism in 1937, critiquing it in precisely these terms.[106]

---

[103] Originally appeared as Landsberg, "Quelques réflexions sur l'idée chrétienne de la personne," *Esprit* 27 (December 1934), 386-399, rpt. in Landsberg, *Problèmes du personnalisme* (Paris, 1952), here 14-16. He expanded on this in his other essays in *Esprit*, notably "Réflexions sur l'engagement personnel" from November 1937.

[104] Ibid. 17, 26.

[105] Ibid. 16.

[106] Landsberg, "Marx et le problème de l'homme," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 51, 1 (10 July 1937), 72-93.

Landsberg's phenomenological, proto-existentialist turn of mind clashed philosophically with Maritain's austere Thomism; in the 1934 essay discussed above, Landsberg argued that properly Christian philosophy must leave behind the classical ideas of being and, as Scheler had suggested, adopt a phenomenological perspective more attuned to *becoming* [devenir] than to static being.[107] "You know that my heart and my intelligence adhere to the Augustinean and not the medieval [read: Thomist] tendency," he wrote to Maritain in 1936. "The possibility of a synthesis between Greek and Christian philosophy seems to me very problematic."[108]

Nonetheless, despite this total incompatibility of philosophical language, the *political* valences of "personalism"—a position beyond politics from which to critique Nazism and Marxism simultaneously as collectivist heresies—was shared with Maritain. France's most famous Thomist, too, revived his old notion of the "person," and its distinction with the individual, in the mid-1930s. It appears in his massive *Distinguer pour unir* (1932), as well as *Du régime temporel et de la liberté* (1933). Maritain's philosophical account of the person remained essentially unchanged from the account given in Chapter One: it remained tied to a Thomist metaphysics of being that was resolutely antithetical to Landsberg's existential focus on "becoming." Politically speaking, however, Maritain's "person" is tied to the same pluralist, anti-étatiste politics as Landsberg's: Maritain, too, worries about the tendency of contemporary states to be ruled by the "mass," and about the person-denying theories of, above all, Nazism and Communism.

This is most clearly demonstrated in *Humanisme Intégral*, one of the landmark works of 1930s Catholicism, which was published in 1936 and based on lectures delivered in August 1934. The work is most famous, and most controversial, for its unapologetic, if ambivalent, modernism: Maritain

---

[107] Landsberg, "Quelques réflexions sur l'idée chrétienne de la personne," 19-21.

[108] Landsberg to Maritain, 16 July 1936, Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim. Scheler, we should note, had felt the same way.

believed that the age of the *sacrum imperium* had decisively passed, and should not be mourned. The collapse of Christian unity provided an opportunity for a "new Christendom," and a Christendom more in keeping with the divine plan. Medieval Christianity was always in danger of immanentizing God's kingdom within the corrupt world of history; current conditions allow us to see clearly the chasm that does and must separate the world of politics and history from that of divinity and redemption (the spirituality of the "heart" and the "private" celebrated earlier). "It is a betrayal of both God and man," Maritain writes, "not to understand that history is in movement towards the kingdom of God. […] But it is nonsensical to think that it will arrive *within* history."[109] This uncoupling of theology and politics allows the flourishing of the free person, who can regain his proper autonomy: the promise of the modern age, Maritain suggests, is that it understands "the dignity and spiritual liberty of the person."[110]

He provides here his first detailed explication of the political consequences of personalism, which was the doctrine that could unite a political community in the interests of the *bien commun*, even in the absence of doctrinal agreement.[111] Following *Quadragesimo Anno,* along with a group of secular theorists such as Georges Gurvitch, Maritain began to argue for a politics of "pluralism": in an age in which absolute gulf between the spiritual and the historical has become evident, theological-political unity becomes both dangerous and heretical. In terms familiar from Chapter 1, he argues for a decentering of sovereignty. He begins, significantly, with a discussion of economics and the need for a collectivization of property that would take the family, and not the class or

[109] Jacques Maritain, *Humanisme intégral* (Paris, 1939), 68-9.

[110] Ibid. 192.

[111] Even the non-Christian society, Maritain holds, can enjoy "une unité d'orientation, qui procède d'une commune aspiration (traversant des couches de culture hétérogènes et dont certaines peuvent être très déficientes) à la forme de vie commune la mieux accordée aux intérêts supra-temporels de la personne." Ibid. 181.

nation, as the true owner.[112] He moves quickly to "juridical pluralism," which is the central axis of his pluralist-personalist politics. By this, Maritain refers to "an organic heterogeneity in the very structure of civil society."[113] The groups and institutions that comprise a healthy civil society, in Maritain's estimation, must be granted as much freedom and legitimacy as possible in the pluralist regime. Alexandre Marc believed that Maritain was coming out in favor of his own corporatist ideas, but Maritain set him straight in a letter: he defended "an organic representation—not merely technical and professional on the one hand and regional on the other, but properly political, I mean expressing the political thoughts of those persons who are members of civil society."[114]

While Maritain does come out strongly in favor of "personalist democracy," this should not mislead us into thinking that Maritain had become any sort of Christian Democrat. His strictures against parliamentary democracy remained as venomous as they had been in the 1920s, as we've seen in his contemporary dispute with Archambault in *l'Aube*. Even in *Integral Humanism*, he criticized parliamentary government, Rousseau-style understandings of democratic sovereignty and "the fictitious democracy of the nineteenth century," and emphasizes that the form of government is, for the Catholic, irrelevant.[115] Maritain is only able to accept democracy by emptying it of its traditional content and replacing it with his theory of the person: true democracy, understood as proper respect for the dignity of the human person, can only be Christian, and can only come about once we transcend the language of class and accept a society of "organic inequalities."[116] Maritain's revolution towards a new Christendom, therefore, does not take the form of a reformulation of

---

[112] Ibid. 178.

[113] Ibid. 177.

[114] Maritain to Marc, 19 March 1935, Fonds Alexandre Marc, AM-118.

[115] Maritain, *Humanisme intégral* 215, 184, 297, 182.

[116] Ibid. 216.

relations of production, or a seizure of power by Christian politicians. Instead, "new political formations" are needed that will be "purely profane"—that is, not an arm of the Church, as was the case with the Zentrum, the clerico-fascist regimes, or even Catholic Action.[117]

The last version of the Christian person to be considered here is that of Gaston Fessard: as we will see, he defended the person in yet a third philosophical language, but nonetheless in support of the same political project. Fessard is primarily remembered as an important figure in the Hegel revival of the 1930s, and as one of few Catholics who attended Kojève's legendary seminars.[118] But he was also a significant personalist: in an important lecture series in 1941, for instance, Fessard and Mounier were the two voices of personalism.[119] Like Landsberg, he was skeptical of Maritain's Thomist account of being: "Were I satisfied with Thomism and the philosophy of being that I was taught," he wrote to his friend Jean Wahl, "I never would have attempted to penetrate Hegel's *Phenomenology*."[120] He made light of Maritain in a letter to Lubac, commenting on a controversy erupting in *Revue Universelle* between Maritain and another Thomist: "As I read these articles, I could not help myself from laughing while thinking about the diversity of theses that one can support with the wonderful principles of this 'perennial' philosophy!"[121] While not a polemicist or a signer of manifestoes, he was widely known in the circle of civil society Catholics, and entirely ignored among the corporatist, proto-fascist Catholics to be considered in the next chapter. *Pax Nostra,* his 1936

---

[117] Historically speaking, the Zentrum was less clerical than Maritain imagined it to be; Maritain had in mind the age of Kaas and not that of Windhorst. See David Blackbourn, *Class, Religion, and Local Politics in Wilhelmine Germany*.

[118] He had begun his engagement with Hegel as early as 1928, putting him at the *avant garde* of French Hegel reception. Gaston Fessard to Henri de Lubac, 28 December 1928, Fonds Fessard, Box 73, Folder 2.

[119] [Program for 1941 lecture series in Lyon], Fonds Fessard, Box 19, Folder 1. Other speakers included Stanislas Fumet and François de Menthon.

[120] Gaston Fessard to Jean Wahl, 16 July 1937, Fonds Fessard, Box 53, Folder WV.

[121] Gaston Fessard to Henri de Lubac, 8 July 1936, Fonds Fessard, Box 73, Folder 2, Fessard Archives.

work on international organization, received extensive coverage in *La Vie Intellectuelle* and *Sept*, while Fessard himself published occasionally in the other civil society journals, *La Vie Catholique* and *Temps présent*.[122] He also, as we'll see more fully in the next section, shared the most characteristic political position of this group: resolute opposition to the Popular Front. His first uses of the "person" coincide with his first political writings, which began to appear in summer 1935. When these articles began to appear, Henri de Lubac excitedly wrote to Fessard about his introduction of "the Person," which "can be regarded as a declaration of method, which is a declaration of principle."[123]

"What is it," Fessard asked near the beginning of *Pax Nostra*, "to be a 'person'?"[124] As a Hegelian, Fessard rejected attempts—be they phenomenological or Thomist—to posit personhood as a transhistorical essence of the human. Instead, the person is founded and structured upon the eruption into history of Christ, the God-man who taught us to overcome the antinomies of our wretched historical existence through fealty to the cross. Fessard asks us to consider the fact that Christ made his appearance among the Jews: precisely those people who demonstrated most clearly the polarity of human existence. The Jews were a particular race claiming unique access to a universal God. Fessard calls this the "Jewish antinomy."[125] Christ appeared among the Jews in order to suture this gap. The God-Man united his two natures—universal God, particular man—in a process that can be described not as a synthesis but as a dialectical *Aufhebung*, a transcendence that preserves. He granted dignity to all men, and made them persons, by showing how we can access the

---

[122] Gabriel Marcel, "Pax Nostra," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 45, 3 (10 November 1936), 407-21. It was also reviewed positively in *Sept*: Joseph Folliet, "Pax Nostra," *Sept* 3, 116 (15 May 1936), 19. Fessard primarily concerned himself with the editorship of *Études*, an essentially apolitical and doctrinal journal of theology. Through the work of Yves de la Brière on the League of Nations, though, even this journal staked out a position in favor of international law and therefore implicitly allied with the civil society Catholics.

[123] Henri de Lubac to Gaston Fessard, 21 June 1935, Fonds Fessard, Folder 73/2.

[124] Gaston Fessard, *Pax Nostra* (Paris, 1936), 39. The account in this paragraph is based on Chapters 1 and 2.

[125] Ibid. 42.

divine in our own individual selves. This was possible through the suspension of the law and the circumscribed, particularist communities that are structured by legal commands, thus resolving the tension at the heart of the Jewish antinomy. Fessard's central Biblical text, and one to which he returned time and time again, was Paul's injunction to the Galatians: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus." (Galatians 3:28)

But the law remains in force: no Hegelian worth his salt could claim that the community of the spirit could sidestep the community of laws in which we live. For Fessard, the law was not abrogated by Christ, as certain millenarians had claimed, nor was the law spiritualized by Christ, as Hegel himself was wont to argue. Instead, the law and the spirit—the particular and the universal—remain in productive tension, constituting the unity that Fessard calls the "person."

> [O]ur notion of the person has a double meaning. On the one hand, the person is the *subject of law,* term and principle of judicial relations, element of a community; in this sense our word descends directly from the Latin *persona,* which, in Roman law, signifies precisely the 'representative in a judicial matter.' On the other hand, the person designates a subject, no longer as a term or principle of relation, but insofar as it is *itself* [a] relation. It is thus the individuality *charged with a role.*[126]

So the law remains, but does not monopolize our relation with God, or with one another. As Fessard goes on to explain, the human person encompasses both Roman law—commands that bind us to our community—and Greek aesthetics of self-creation.

Like Landsberg and Maritain, then, Fessard held that the person pointed to a space beyond the political community, but also that this access to the divine should leaven the sphere of secular politics. This released Fessard, as it did Maritain and Landsberg, from obligation to provide a positive social or political program in this work ostensibly dedicated to social and political problems. "As neither a diplomat, nor a member of the League of Nations," Fessard wrote, "I cannot […]

[126] Ibid. 44.

propose a concrete solution to any conflict whatsoever."[127] In a letter to a friend about the preparation of *Pax Nostra*, he proudly assumed Julien Benda's label: "Of course, I don't engage in any politics in this paper and it is, in a way, purely phenomenological! In my view, this is all that an intellectual [clerc] can do."[128]

Pax Nostra was nonetheless a work of political philosophy. For Fessard, our personhood beyond law allows us to understand the structure of those laws, to which we remain bound. Fessard strikes a delicate balance: for him, the law is an important part of our personhood, and thus the Christian believer cannot, as a beautiful soul, abstract himself from the constitution of political society. "Modern man," Fessard reminds us, "is always to some degree a 'member of the sovereign.'"[129] So then the problem becomes how to construct a political society that is nonetheless respectful of our personhood. Like Landsberg and Maritain, Fessard was invested in a decentering of sovereignty, in which the nation-state's supreme assumption of sovereign power would be challenged by the competing claims of man's natural societies: primarily the family and the church.[130] The root of society is not the contracting individual, as Rousseau or Locke had claimed, but rather the family. In a remarkable philosophy of history, Fessard attempts to upend Rousseau's founding myth with one of his own, in which the state is not the institutionalization of the general will beyond the particularistic needs of intermediary societies, but rather the capstone of a long, historical process of familial organization.[131] From this perspective, the state appears as one community out of

---

[127] Ibid. 38-9.

[128] Gaston Fessard to Henri de Lubac, 26 April 1935, Fonds Fessard, Box 73, Folder 2.

[129] Fessard, *Pax Nostra* 72.

[130] Ibid. 408.

[131] Ibid. 410 *passim*.

many to which we belong. When this is forgotten, Fessard warns, our personhood is decimated by statolatry and totalitarianism: the political forms of secularism.

Through an analysis of Thomist, phenomenological, and Hegelian personalism, we see that the "person" as a political subject was the name for the inhabitant of the federalized, non-étatiste community for which Catholics had been arguing for decades. It was, nonetheless, a new vocabulary and for new times. In one of the rare reflections on the novelty of the concept, one Catholic writer in 1938 admits as much: "when we speak today of the person, we reach an agreement with negative positions. We rise up, for instance, against Marxist or Nazi tyranny."[132] So while there is clear resonance between the anti-sovereign, anti-legal arguments of the 1930s and the monarchist or socialist federalism of the 1920s, there is a marked change in emphasis. This can only be explained by a change in political context: in the 1930s, Rhenish Catholics and some of their French counterparts took a dramatic turn away from the utopian political projects of the 1920s—both Maurras's royalism and Wittig's socialism had, after all, been condemned—and towards the new anti-politics of personalism. Whereas liberalism and republicanism had been the threats of the 1920s, it was obvious that these trends were in abeyance in the 1930s, and Catholic theorists now considered totalitarianism, and the Popular Front as its domestic form and "human face," to be the primary threat to the future of Christian Europe. The anti-modernism—opposition to democracy, the ideals of 1789—remained, translated into a new form. For civil-society Catholics, totalitarianism was the end-result of a heretical modernity, not a resurgence of dictatorial atavism.

Totalitarianism

In this section, I will extend the above analysis to show that anti-totalitarianism was the precise political form taken by the anti-politics of the person, in both the four personalists named

[132] Louis Salleron, "Réfléxions sur le régime à naître," *Combat* 3, 30 (December 1938), not paginated.

above and a whole host of others. As we will see, personalists were a major force behind the introduction of the term: Gurian was, I believe, the first theorist of totalitarianism. He came to the theory in 1932, and giving it an influential book-length airing in 1935; this was read by Maritain, who began using "totalitarianism" in 1936.[133] Fessard, for his part, began using the term in 1935, too, and when *La Vie Catholique* had a special issue on "Catholicisme et totalitarismes" in 1937, it was to Fessard that they turned for their lead article.[134] That same year, when *Sept* signaled its absolute opposition to collaboration with Communists, Fessard's name was listed as an authority behind only that of Cardinal Verdier and the Pope himself, and Landsberg signaled his opposition to totalitarianism in *Esprit*.[135]

The 1930s revival of personalism was closely tied with the birth of totalitarianism theory. The notion of the person, as we saw in the previous section, is almost always introduced as part of the critique of the state: this made it particularly suited as the companion piece to totalitarianism theory, which is at root a critique of extreme étatisme. Once the notion of totalitarianism was born, one seldom appeared without the other. The first book specifically about the person, although from a Protestant perspective, was Denis de Rougemont, *Politique de la Personne* (1934): it was also one of the earliest works to refer to "l'État totalitaire" in the mature sense. In that same year, J.T. Delos condemned "the affirmation of the primacy of the interests of a totalitarian society, national or

[133] It was also present in his *Deutsche Briefe*. See, for instance, "Nationalsozialismus und Bolschewismus," *Deutsche Briefe* 28 (12 April 1935), 305-6 (this comes from *Deutsche Briefe*, ed. Heinz Hürten (Mainz, 1969), which reprints *Deutsche Briefe* in full).

[134] Fessard, "L'Église et la liberté," *La Vie Catholique* 14, 683 (30 October 1937), 1-2. It appears in *Pax Nostra*, which was written in 1935 and appeared in early 1936.

[135] --, "Ce dont nous prenons la responsabilité," *Sept* 4, 149 (1 January 1937), 4. Landsberg, "Réflexions sur l'engagement personnel," *Esprit* 62 (November 1937), 179-97, here 197.

ethnic, over the rights of the human person."[136] Personalism and totalitarianism both appeared in the landmark manifesto, *Pour le bien commun* (although the totalitarianism theory, which excluded Bolshevism, was still immature). The second book about the person was Pierre-Henri Simon's deeply Catholic *Destins de la Personne* (1935), and it was uncoincidentally one of the first books to make full use of totalitarianism theory. Its reviewer in *La Vie Intellectuelle* defines personalism as a philosophy that

> taking the sovereignty of the human person as fundamental, attempts to escape from, on the one hand, all modern forms of the collectivist or 'totalitarian' spirit, destructor of liberty, negation of the eminent dignity of the human person; and on the other hand, liberal individualism.[137]

Examples could easily be multiplied; one obscure Catholic, in an unremarkable screed against Communism and the Popular Front, felt no need to explain himself when he warned of "a suppression of the human person by the totalitarian state."[138] "The totalitarian State," wrote another in 1938, "demands only the neglect of liberty and the resignation of the Person."[139] This was true for British Catholics, too: "Hegel and the modern totalitarians proclaim the State, Class, or Race as a

---

[136] Delos, "L'Éducation au service des faux dieux," *Ordre social et éducation* (Nice, 1934), 79-102, here 100. Pierre-Henri Simon emphasized Delos's account of "philosophies totalitaires" in his account of the Semaines Sociales for *Sept*. Pierre-Henri Simon, "L'éducation pour la personne," *Sept* 1, 23 (4 August 1934), 2.

[137] B. Guyon, "Destins de la Personne," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 41, 1 (25 Feb 36), 89-94. I could go on, but hopefully the point is made. One more especially clear example: "L'État totalitaire s'occupe des choses de la vie. Il veut bien suppléer aux options de l'homme. Il ne demande qu'une adhésion. Il ne demande que l'abandon de la liberté et la démission de la Personne." H. Thomas, "L'expérience économique du régime nationalsocialiste," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 59, 1 (10 October 1938), 32-42, here 42.

[138] J. de Bivort de la Saudée, *L'Antireligion communiste (1917-1937)* (Paris, 1937), 105.

[139] H. Thomas, "L'expérience économique du régime nationalsocialiste," *La Vie Intellectuele* 59, 1 (10 October 1938), 32-42, here 42.

totality," V.A. Demant warned in 1936. The Christian response is couched in personalist terms: "The freedom for which the Church can fight is the freedom of the person to be a person."[140]

We have already seen, in the introduction to Part II, Carl Schmitt's introduction of the language of the "total" into Catholic argumentation, and it's no accident that all of the figures I discuss in this chapter conceived of their projects explicitly in opposition to that of Schmitt, with whom all of them save Fessard had been close in the 1920s.[141] Schmitt's 1931 pebble into the water caused ripple effects throughout Catholic intellectual life, which I'll attempt to track in this section before turning to a more substantive analysis of mid-1930s Catholic anti-totalitarianism in the writings of Gurian, Maritain, and Fessard.

It first found its way into anti-Bolshevik polemic in Waldemar Gurian's influential *Bolschewismus, einführung in geschichte und lehre* (1931), which appeared in English, French, Italian, and Dutch by 1933. But the time was not yet ripe: Gurian's book was neither translated nor widely-remarked. It was his next work, *Bolschewismus als Weltgefahr* (1935), that sent shock waves through Catholic intellectual culture across Europe and America. Although written and published in Switzerland—and widely reviewed in both America and throughout the German exile press—the book was primarily an event in French intellectual history.[142] It was read in German by at least three

---

[140] V.A. Demant, *Christian Polity* (London, 1936), 90-1. Demant was actually an Anglo-Catholic, but for our purposes this is not especially important: his Thomist, personalist essay in which this declaration appears is entitled, "The Catholic Doctrine of Freedom."

[141] Maritain, *Humanisme intégral* 110, 158; Gurian, [as Paul Müller], "Entscheidung und Ordnung. Zu den Schriften von Carl Schmitt," *Schweizerische Rundschau* 34 (1934/5), 566-76 (among others); Landsberg, "Feind der Menschheit," *Die Zukunft* 2, 2 (27 October 1939), 6. Fessard, unlike the others, had not been close with Schmitt in the 1920s and, perhaps for this reason, was less inclined to fulminate against Schmitt in public. His private notes, however, reveal that he had been a close follower of Schmitt's works in the early 1930s, and was especially interested in his teachings of the state as *Ganzheit*. See the 1936 notes on Schmitt and the "cynisme des états totalitaires" in Fonds Fessard, Box 19, folder 1. Box 77 is dedicated to works both by and about Schmitt that Fessard collected and annotated in the 1930s.

[142] According to Gurian's own clippings, it was reviewed in an honor roll of prominent Catholic and resistance journals (whether of a socialist or Catholic stripe): *Luzerner Neuest Nachrichten, Kirchenblatt für die reformierte Schweize, Die Katholische Schweizerin, Catholic Herald, Kereszytén Igazsàg, Zeitschrift für Sozialismus, Schweizerische Studentenverein, Das Aufgebot, Vaterland, Theologische Blätter, Philosophical Review, Het Vaderland, Grazer Volksblatt, La vie économique social, Wiener Politische Blätter,*

influential Catholic totalitarianism theorists—Robert d'Harcourt, Jacques Maritain, and Yves Simon—and many more in French, both through its translation and the précis of the book's argument that Gurian published in *La Vie Intellectuelle* in January 1936.[143] D'Harcourt wrote a glowing front-page review in *L'Echo de Paris*, a Catholic newspaper with a circulation of over one hundred thousand, which was in turn excerpted in both *Figaro* and *La Croix*, the most prestigious newspapers of French conservatism and Catholicism, respectively.[144]

As the name implies, Gurian's book was designed to show that Bolshevism was the primary, world-historical danger, and that Nazism was no more than a "brown Bolshevism." The fact that it received an explosive response, when his 1932 volume had been neglected, can be chalked up to new political concerns. In the interim years—that is, between 1932 and 1935—totalitarianism had become cutting-edge in Catholic circles, as it perfectly met the political needs of civil-society Catholicism: an anti-étatiste political vocabulary that would not commit its wielder to any particular political form, least of all hated parliamentary liberalism, while also providing a convenient way to undercut the pretensions of the Popular Front. 1935 also saw another book-length version of Catholic totalitarianism theory: Joseph Vialatoux's *La Cité de Hobbes: Théorie de l'État Totalitaire*, the

---

Irénikon, Nouvelle Revue Théologique, Wiener Zeitung, Christliche Ständestaat, Der Deutsche in Polen, The Commonweal, Bohemia, Neuer Vorwärts, Univers, La Croix, Figaro, Neue Zürcher Zeitung, La Vie Intellectuelle. These can all be found in Gurian Papers, Box 11, Folder 7

143 *La Croix*, 16,226 (11 January 1936), 5; *Figaro* 111, 13 (13 January 1936), 4. François Coty's *Figaro* was not, we should note, the *Figaro* of today!

144 Maritain to Gurian, 20 August 1935, Gurian Papers, Box 5, Folder 18, in which he reports that he is going to agitate in favor of its translation with his friend, Stanislas Fumet. D'Harcourt to Gurian, 25 September 1935, Gurian Papers, Box 4, Folder 10 (praising the work and offering to write a foreword). Yves Simon to Gurian, 25 May 1936, Gurian Papers, Box 7, Folder 22 (claiming he'd used it in his book on Ethiopia). For Gurian's French précis, see "Bolchévisme rouge et bolchévisme brun," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 40 (1936), 53-67 Robert d'Harcourt, "Bolchevisme et Hitlérisme," *L'Echo de Paris* 20,538 (10 January 1936), 1-2. See also Iswolsky to Gurian, [undated], Gurian Papers, Box 4, Folder 12. The letter was clearly written later, but in it she reminisces about her study of the book in Paris. Voegelin to Gurian, 18 December 1936, Gurian Papers, Box 8, Folder 17. *Temps Présent* made it clear that Gurian "thinks with" that journal, one of the premier voices of civil society Catholicism. Quoted in [anonymous], "French Paper Notes Maritain's Visit," *The Notre Dame Scholastic* 72, 13 (13 January 1939), 5, 22, here 22.

first monograph to have any form of "totalitarian" in the title in French, German, or English. Vialatoux was another member of the civil-society Catholicism school: he made his name, like his friend Maritain, by opposing Maurras in 1927, and had signed the bellwether manifesto, *Pour le bien commun*.[145] Neither Gurian nor Landsberg felt called upon to intervene in French public life, but their constant attacks on Communism *qua* totalitarianism were clearly not designed to grease the path towards Communist/Catholic cooperation. Landsberg signaled his agreement with Fessard's clearly anti-Front politics in a 1937 letter, and in an interview the same year he praised Maritain's equally anti-Front politics of *Humanisme Intégral*.[146]

So even though the theory was available in its mature form as early as 1932, it only took off inasmuch as it was utilized in a political, anti-Front context in 1935-6. In Sturzo's contribution to the *L'Aube* controversy in February 1934, and in *Pour le bien commun*—both written before the Popular Front had emerged as a serious threat—"totalitarian" regimes are discussed, but the Soviet Union is explicitly excluded from the term's umbrella. In spring 1934, Catholics, following Gurian's lead, began to apply the term to the Soviet regime: Henri Daniel-Rops did so in *Sept* in March 1934, while, in April, an editorialist at *La Vie Intellectuelle* did the same.[147] Among Rhenish Germans, too: Friedrich Fuchs, who had moved in Gurian's circles in the 1920s, attacked Schmitt's "total state" in

---

[145] On him, see Emmanuel Gabellieri, "Catholicisme social et Metaphysique en action: La pensée de J.Vialatoux," in *Theophilyon* X, 1 (2005), 9-43, esp. 24-8 for a reading of Vialatoux's anti-totalitarianism in light of his opposition to Durkheimean ideas of the social (cf. Cochin and Maurras).

[146] Landsberg to Fessard, 3 July 1937, Fonds Fessard, Box 52, Folder L. "D'un nouvel humanisme ou d'un humanisme intégral," *Union pour la vérité* 44, 9-10 (June-July 1937), 351-418, here page 401 (this was a group discussion about Maritain's book, featuring Fessard and Maritain himself in addition to Landsberg).

[147] Henri Daniel-Rops, "Communisme et Communauté," *Sept* 1, 4 (24 March 1934), 16; Istina, "Plans," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 28, 1 (10 April 1934), 5-8. Istina was not a person, but the name of a Dominican study center charged with the study of Russia.

1933, while Karl Thieme—probably Gurian's closest collaborator at the time—criticized "Carl Schmitt's totalitarian political philosophy" in 1934.[148]

By early 1935, totalitarianism had become a leading Catholic method for understanding the pathology of modernity. Christianus, who as ever provides the clearest insight into the oft-unspoken wisdom of civil-society Catholicism, wrote an editorial in February 1935 called, simply, "Totalitaire": this was an important moment for the concept, as *La Vie Intellectuelle* was the home-base for these Catholic intellectuals, and it appeared here, not as a tentative neologism as in the past, but as a front-page moniker for the demons we face. "Fashionable word, dangerous word," as Christianus referred to it. "What does totalitarianism mean?," […] [T]he class or the race which wants to ferociously be itself, one hundred percent proletarian or Aryan."[149] In the next issue, J.T. Delos wrote at length about totalitarianism and defined it in general terms. "The totalitarian state, understood in its exact meaning (that is, understood in light of the fundamental conception of man of society from which it is derived) is a new phenomenon that concerns the very notion of civilization."[150] By April the concept had become so entrenched that a student group could call a meeting with the theme, "The Student in the Totalitarian State."[151] In the fall of 1935, Abbé Charles Journet, a close friend of Maritain's, published an article in his widely-read *Nova et Vetera* entitled "The Church and the Totalitarian Communities."[152] This was also, of course, the year in which Gurian's *Bolschewismus als Weltgefahr* appeared, as well as Vialatoux's book-length treatment of "l'état totalitaire." By 1938—by

---

[148] Friedrich Fuchs, "Der totale Staat und seine Grenze," *Hochland* 30, 1 (1932-3), 558-60; Karl Thieme, *Deutsche evangelische Christen auf dem Wege zur katholischen Kirche*, 42.

[149] Christianus, "Totalitaire," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 33, 2 (10 February 1935), 354-6, here 354.

[150] J.T. Delos, "Pour un ordre catholique," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 34, 1 (25 February 1935), 44-47, here 45.

[151] Un Étudiant, "L'Étudiant dans l'État totalitaire," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 36, 1 (25 May 1935), 137-40

[152] Charles Journet, "L'Eglise et les communautés totalitaires," *Nova et Vetera* 10, 4 (Oct-Dec. 1935), 431-9. I am grateful to René Mougel for this reference.

which point, recall, the phrase had appeared only a few times on the left—Bruno de Solages was doing nothing new when he explained, "I am using the word 'totalitarianism' [totalitarisme] and not the word 'socialism' as the opposite of the word 'individualism' because, in our language, 'socialism' does not include the socialisms of the 'right', or fascisms."[153]

In 1936, the Holy Office of the Vatican—which had, unsurprisingly given the term's Italian provenance, been using the language of "totalitarianism" for some time—determined that, in light of new geopolitical realities, Bolshevism was a form of totalitarianism, too.[154] In the Holy Office's never-issued document, entitled "Propositions [to be Condemned] on Racism, Nationalism, Communism, Totalitarianism", it is stressed that totalitarian states claim hegemony over "civil society" and deny the "innate rights" of "mankind and the family."[155] Although the Church was famously reticent to publicly criticize either the Fascist or Nazi regimes, they were doubtless included under the "totalitarian" rubric as well.[156] The 1931 encyclical *Non abbiamo bisogno*, in its warnings against "statolatry," for instance, referred just as much to Italian Fascism as to Bolshevism. The most clear display of the Church's "double no" to Bolshevism and Nazism came in 1937, when the Vatican released two encyclicals (*Divini Redemptoris* and *Mit brennender Sorge*) devoted to the twin heresies.

---

[153] Bruno de Solages, "Personnes et Société: leurs rapports," *La personne humaine en peril. Semaines Sociales de France, XXIXème session* (Lyon, 1938), 229-50, here 236.

[154] Besier and Piombo, *The Holy See and Hitler's Germany*, 153.

[155] Godman, *Hitler and the Vatican*, 199.

[156] Gurian, for instance, wrote a furious pamphlet about the inactivity of the German bishops, and the Vatican hierarchy warned Gurian to call off the attacks (years later, Otto Knab was wary of publishing this correspondence, fearful that it portrayed the Church in a negative light). Gurian [as Stefan Kirchmann], *St. Ambrosius und die deutschen Bischöfe* (Liga-Verlag, Luzern, 1934); Heinz Hürten, *Waldmar Gurian*, 116; Otto Knab to John Oesterreicher, 3 March 1964, John Oesterreicher Archives, Seton Hall University, SHU RG 26.4.1, Box 5.

In the work of Maritain and Vialatoux, we are provided a rare opportunity to track the career of "totalitarianism" with precision. Vialatoux's volume is characteristic of the new totalitarian discourse. First, in its timing: there was nothing new about Catholic fear of Bolshevism or saber-rattling nationalism. Indeed, the Semaines Sociales de France had dedicated several sessions in July 1933 to the menace of Fascism, Bolshevism, and Nazism (without recourse to the vocabulary of totalitarianism, whose political utility was not yet apparent). Vialatoux had spoken at that meeting about their common materialist root, but he did not use the concept of totalitarianism, either. In his 1935 volume, though, he would cite these same lectures as diagnoses of totalitarianism, and he used the concept in a mature way: that is, as a pathology linking modernity, Nazism, and Bolshevism. He had thus come to the vocabulary sometime in 1934 or early 1935. Vialatoux was also characteristic in his discussion of the great flaw at the heart of the totalitarian experiment: the denial and misrecognition of the human person.[157] A similar phenomenon can be tracked in the case of Maritain's essay, "Un nouvel humanisme." Its first version—a lecture delivered in Spain in 1934—does not use totalitarianism, and neither does its second version, published in *Esprit* in October 1935. In that version, Maritain describes Communism as "above all a religion assured of responding to all of the fundamental questions posed by life, and destined to replace all other religions." In the 1936 version, this reads exactly the same, except that "destined to replace all other religions" is replaced by "manifests an unequaled totalitarian power."[158] It was added sometime between then and the summer of 1936, when the final version of the essay appeared in *Humanisme Intégral*.[159] The

---

[157] He was involved, at least socially, with the circle around *Esprit*. Henri de Lubac to Gaston Fessard, 24 July 1935, Fonds Fessard, Folder 73/2, reporting a dinner Lubac had recently had with Jean Lacroix and Vialatoux.

[158] Maritain, *Humanisme intégral* 44. Note that Maritain did use the term in October 1935, in another article in *Esprit*, but as in *Pour le bien commun* the year previously, he used it to cover fascism and Nazism, and, explicitly, not Communism. Jacques Maritain, "Des chances historiques d'une nouvelle chrétienté," *Esprit* 37 (October 1935), 101-17, here 112.

[159] "Totalitarianism" features in *Humanisme Intégral* in three major places: chapter 2, chapter 4, and chapter 7. Each of these sections was added between the August 1934 lectures, on which the book was based, and the final version's

other addition that was made to the same section was, as we would expect, a critique of the Popular Front. Maritain, like many others, came to anti-totalitarianism and anti-frontisme at the same time.[160]

Let's look more closely at the totalitarian theories of our major figures, focusing on the analyses of Bolshevism in the work of Gurian, Maritain, and Fessard: for all of them, Bolshevism was the primary danger to Christian civilization, and Nazism only a derivative, however dangerous, of the original totalitarian perversion. We will see that, despite their differences, two major theses unite the various totalitarian theories at work in civil-society Catholicism: first, that totalitarianism is absolutely and formally antithetical to Catholic religion; second, that totalitarianism is the final and most catastrophic fruit of modernity itself.

In *Um des Reiches Zukunft*, the first major work on the total state, there are two particular features of the total state that are worthy of note. First, in its drive to politicize everything, and subdue it into a servant of the nationalist mythology, the total state cannot exist alongside the Catholic Church, which is a juridical entity with recourse to a source of legitimacy outside of the state.[161] Here, Gurian parrots his and Maritain's position in the Action française debates of the late 1920s. The National Socialists might ally with the Church as an opponent of liberalism, Gurian suggests, "but not as a community dignified with its own laws, which are independent from the extant political and social order." In other words, the National Socialists could never accept "the

---

publication in 1936. The original 1934 lectures were published as Jacques Maritain, *Problemas Espirituales y Temporales de una Nueva Cristianidad* (Madrid, 1935).

[160] Maritain, *Humanisme intégral* 45-7.

[161] Walter Gerhart [i.e. Gurian], *Um des Reiches Zukunft* (Freiburg, 1932), Chapter 9, "Der neue Nationalismus als religiös-metaphysische Bewegung"

visible church [die sichtbare Kirche]": the pregnant formulation that Schmitt himself had used to defend the Church years earlier.[162]

Second, the total state is a consummation of liberalism and disenchantment, reproducing their nihilist worldlessness; the trumpeted antiliberalism of the Nazis is a screen for a fundamental similarity. During the bourgeois nineteenth century, Gurian argued following Scheler, the transcendent order of value had been ignored in favor of a heretical focus on the immanent, and a hubristic belief in the self-sufficiency of man. The totalitarian regimes of the twentieth century bring this to its frightful apotheosis. "Marxism, and therefore Bolshevism," he had already written in 1931, "does but voice the secret and unavowed philosophy of the bourgeois society."[163] And, in his work on nationalism the following year, he claimed that "[t]he new nationalism flees from the optimistic immanence of the nineteenth century towards a pessimistic or fateful immanence, whose final realities are no longer individuality and reason, but *Volk* and fate."[164] The immanence, and the concomitant belief that humanity's goals are internal to the economic or political order, remains. "Antiliberalism," Gurian concludes, "proves itself to be the completion of liberalism."[165]

In *Integral Humanism*, "totalitarianism" is the name that Maritain gives to the tragedy of secular modernity: the fate of a Europe that ignores Christian principles is, Maritain argues repeatedly, totalitarianism.[166] In Maritain's account, we can see the same major characteristics of totalitarianism that appear in Gurian's work: its absolute, formal incompatibility with Catholicism,

---

[162] Ibid. 169. For Schmitt on "The Visibility of the Church," see his essay by that title, included as an appendix to *Roman Catholicism and Political Form*, *op. cit.*, 45-60.

[163] Waldemar Gurian, *Bolshevism*, trans. E.I. Watkin (New York, 1931), 237.

[164] Gurian, *Um des Reiches Zukunft* 194-5.

[165] Ibid. 201.

[166] Maritain, *Humanisme Intégral*, 294.

and its rootedness in the modern, emancipatory project. "Atheism is not a necessary *consequence* of the [Marxist] social system," Maritain writes, "but rather is presupposed as its *principle*." Maritain had been arguing, at least since 1926, that the Church could not be equated with concrete political positions. How, then, can Bolshevism be equated with atheism? As in Gurian, the answer to this question is, simply, "totalitarianism": Bolshevism is more than a political or social system, but a new entity that, through its totalitarian claims to dominance, abolishes the possibility of Christian spirituality as understood from a personalist perspective. "The profound evils of the 'new civilization' in Russia," Maritain writes, "are summarized in Communist totalitarianism itself." To return to a previously cited passage:

> [Communism] is a complete system of doctrine and of life, which claims to unveil the meaning of existence, respond to all fundamental questions that life poses, and manifest an unequaled totalitarian power. It is a religion.

The totalizing character of Communism leads to violence towards "the human person, whose dignity is fundamentally spiritual." In this way, Maritain squares the circle of Catholic politics: the believer should not enlist the Church in support of temporal political arrangements, but the Church can nonetheless take a stand against regimes that, through their "the totalitarian requisition of the energies of man," make religion impossible.[167]

As in Gurian, totalitarianism was not understood as the rejection of modernity, but as its apotheosis: "a product of bourgeois decadence." Totalitarianism was, for Maritain, the apogee of the "tragedy of [anthropocentric] humanism" whose origins are to be found in the Renaissance and the Reformation.[168] This, too, might seem strange, as *Integral Humanism* is renowned for its tentative acceptance of the secular, modern political settlement. While it is true that it partakes of none of the

[167] Ibid. 44, 94, 48, 56, 75.

[168] Ibid. Chapter 1.

flamboyant atavism of his earlier works, Maritain's acceptance of post-Reformation trends is deeply hedged. He held out the hope that a "new Christendom" was in the offing that would be more than a return to feudalism, but this did not affect his reading of bourgeois modernity. In Maritain's philosophy of history, the secularism of the industrial revolution led to such massive ressentiment and inequalities that it birthed Communism, fear of which led to fascism, the other totalitarianism. On a more fundamental level, too, "socialist humanism takes over from bourgeois humanism." For the bourgeoisie, God becomes no more than an idea legitimating the immanent power of man; socialism merely gives this process a final "reversal" by instantiating immanent power practically, in the order of social and economic reality.[169]

I will turn, lastly, to Gaston Fessard, who was destined to play a more important role in domestic European debates after World War II than either Gurian or Maritain, who found homes and audiences in America. While *Pax Nostra* (1936), discussed above, utilized totalitarianism theory and vocabulary, it was not until *La main tendue?* (1937) that Fessard launched his career as an anti-totalitarian activist, which he would revive to great effect in 1946, as we will see in Chapter 7. Like Maritain's *Humanisme intégral*, Fessard's work was explicitly anti-Front. The title of his 1937 volume on Communism referred to the April 1936 radio address in which Maurice Thorez, secretary of the PCF, had "extended a hand" to Catholics, arguing in the spirit of the *Front Populaire* that Catholics and Communists could unite in the anti-fascist struggle. Fessard rejected Thorez's extended hand, and his book-length dismissal became one of the most prominent interventions in the public debate occasioned by Thorez's surprising offer.[170]

---

[169] Ibid. 74, 295, 67.

[170] He wrote about these themes in *La Vie Intellectuelle* and *La Croix*, as well. The book itself was widely reviewed and discussed; Fessard maintained a whole sheaf of clippings which can be found in Box 1, Folder 10, Fonds Fessard.

As with Gurian and Maritain, we can focus on two axes of Fessard's anti-totalitarianism: his belief that Catholic religion is *necessarily* anti-totalitarian, and that totalitarianism is another name for secularism. He takes a somewhat different tack than the other two, as his philosophical grounding is not Thomist but Hegelian. His critique of Bolshevism is rooted in Marx's landmark 1843 essay, "On the Jewish Question."[171] In that essay, Marx had criticized the liberal tendency to separate the spheres of society and politics, implying that these two halves would be reunited in the Communist utopia to come. This "reintegration" was deemed totalitarian by Fessard, who delighted in pointing out the absurdity of the French Communist Party's claims to protect religious freedom. "The founder of communism," Fessard declared, "had already criticized a constitution and declaration of the rights of the citizen closely resembling the ones of which the Soviet Union is currently so proud."[172]

Like Gurian and Maritain, he goes further and argues that totalitarianism, the name of the conjunction of the political and the social, as a consequence of modernization and secularization. We have already seen that, for Fessard, the "human person" necessarily escapes the bounds of law, and any attempt to fully interpret human existence in politico-legal terms could only be to deny Christ's incarnation and return to the arid legalism of the Hebrews. Dialectical philosophy, as it existed in both Marx and Hegel, attempted to abolish the distinctions between the social, the political, and the religious that, as Fessard had already argued in *Pax Nostra*, were fundamental to human social life.[173] "The opposition of the social and the political is truly essential to Humanity," Fessard warned, "and both Marx and Hegel fail to understand how this opposition […] constitutes a

[171] This account of Fessard's thought is based on Fessard, *La main tendue*, Chapter VI.

[172] Ibid. 147.

[173] See Fessard, *Pax Nostra*, Annexe I.

tension essential to human progress."[174] The absolutization of the political (Hegel's own solution) led to fascist étatisme, while the absolutization of the social (Marx's) led to Bolshevism. Both of these are denials of the legitimate divisions of sovereignty which are *natural* to the human condition and overseen by the church: "Against the totalitarian state, which would tend to absorb everything," Fessard had written in *Pax Nostra* the year before, "[the church] protects the individual and the family."[175] Like Maritain, Fessard held that these two totalitarianisms spring from the same roots, both metaphysical and historical: it was Bolshevism's emphasis on the social that had summoned a revenge of the neglected political, which was called "fascism."[176]

In this way, Fessard arrived at an anti-totalitarian personalism that, like the theories of his fellow Catholics described in this chapter, legitimated a Catholicism within the limits of civil society. Although this theory, and its unstated but significant political consequences, would become hegemonic on the postwar European scene, it was nonetheless a minority current in the 1930s, even within Catholicism. Most Catholics, and most Catholic intellectuals, continued to believe in the possibility and viability of a Catholic politics, and they will be the subject of the next chapter. This no longer took the form of monarchism, but rather of authoritarian corporatism (of the type seen in Dollfuss and Pétain). Surprisingly enough, however, they too became "anti-totalitarian personalists," and it was under these same keywords that the Catholic authoritarians of the 1930s would sail into the mainstream of Christian Democracy after 1945.

---

[174] Fessard, *La main tendue* 160.

[175] Fessard, *Pax Nostra* 409.

[176] Fessard, *La main tendue* 151-2.

Chapter 5: Anti-Totalitarian Authoritarianism: Dietrich von Hildebrand, François Perroux, and Catholic Corporatism

No politicization of Catholicism—instead, a Catholicization of politics.
--Dietrich von Hildebrand, 1935[1]

The crisis does not, therefore, strike *a form, or a type of state, but the modern state itself.*
--François Perroux, 1938[2]

Introduction

Perhaps it is not surprising to find civil-society Catholics speaking in terms of "personalism" and "anti-totalitarianism": those seem like negative political ideals, perfectly suited to those who simply want to carve out a space within the polity for the Christian mission, from which the "new Christendom" could sprout. Surprisingly, though, we find the same concepts at work in the sworn enemies of the Catholic Action approach: the corporatists. In this chapter, we will explore the transnational political culture of those Catholics, probably in the majority, who genuinely supported authoritarian and non-democratic solutions to interwar crisis.

"The majority of Catholics are so confident in the ideology of the right," wrote one exasperated contributor to *La Vie Intellectuelle* in 1936, "that they are unable to distinguish conservatism from Catholic doctrine."[3] French Catholics of the mid-1930s were inflamed by Colonel de la Rocque and his Parti social français [PSF], which arose during the mid-1930s years of crisis and partook of the intellectual culture of corporatism to be explicated in this chapter. This was no mere crackpot right-wing party: it was, on the contrary, the largest political party of the period.[4] It

[1] Dietrich von Hildebrand, "Quietistische Gefahr," *Christliche Ständestaat* 2, 10 (10 March 1935), 227-8, here 227.

[2] François Perroux, *Capitalisme et communauté de travail* (Paris, 1938), 253

[3] [Anonymous], "Dieu est-il à droite?" *La Vie Intellectuelle* 41, 1 (25 Feb 36), 49-72, here 50.

[4] See Sean Kennedy, *Reconciling France against Democracy* (Montreal, 2007), Chapter 6.

seemed to have a bright future: Portugal, Spain, and Austria actually took the Catholic corporatist plunge.

Corporatism emerged in the mid-1930s as a full-fledged social theory that should take its place alongside Nazism and Communism as the major theories of national and international order that were battling it out in 1930s Europe. Consider the explicitly corporatist Parti social français: although the largest political party in the Third Republic, it had a nebulous relationship to parliament, and should more properly be understood as an attempt to inaugurate a new form of corporatist social order. In the *colonies de vacance* sponsored by Croix de Feu and the PSF, thousands of schoolchildren were educated in the corporatist ideal. What they learned, Laura Lee Downs summarizes, was to restore "social harmony through the replacement of class conflict by traditional social hierarchies, welded together by ties of reciprocal duty, mutual responsibility, and a shared love of the French nation."[5] Most Catholics, that is, still believed in such a thing as a properly Catholic politics. "There is a political Catholicism," wrote one of Dollfuss's supporters, "and every good Catholic must decide in its favor."[6]

There is nothing new in this observation, of course. But in this chapter, I will discuss "corporatist Catholicism"—the opponent of "civil-society Catholicism"—in such a way that its myriad ties with the Cold War Catholicism to come will become apparent. Corporatist politics, we will see, were not abolished in the cauldron of World War II, but survived as an ideological apparatus into the welfare statism of the early Cold War. Corporatism had, in other words, uninetended consequences. Downs has already shown the ways in which PSF activism, despite its

---

[5] Laura Lee Downs, " 'Each and every one of you must become a *chef*': Toward a Social Politics of Working-Class Childhood on the Extreme Right in 1930s France," *Journal of Modern History* 81, 1 (2009), 1-44, here 6.

[6] Nikolaus Heinrich [pseudonym for Nikolaus Dohrn], "Politischer Katholizismus und Illegalität," *Christliche Ständestaat* 38, 2 (22 September 1935), 903-6, here 903.

avowed anti-feminist ideologies, in fact groomed women for leadership roles and provided space for outcomes that diverged from its original intention. While Downs focused on gender opportunities, this chapter and those to come will focus on political culture. The illiberal corporatisms of the mid-1930s, despite its author's intentions, translated itself into the welfare statism of postwar stability. One leading corporatist wrote in 1932 that Catholics that Catholics could support social democracy, but never liberal democracy; this position had its defenders among Austrian Catholics, too.[7] After 1945, this social democracy came into being.

As we will see in Part III, support for fascist regimes did not disqualify these intellectuals from post-war influence; indeed, the opposite seems to have been the case. Although Maritain, Gurian, and Fessard were important post-war figures, it is significant that the first two spent the majority of their time in America and relinquished much of their continental influence (Maritain's post-1945 works were not big sellers in France, for instance). Within France and Germany, these corporatist Catholics remained more important: Jean de Fabrègues as editor of *La France Catholique*, André Voisin as editor of *La Fédération*, Eugen Kogon as editor of *Frankfurter Hefte*, Emil Franzel as editor of *Neues Abendland*, Eberhard Welty as editor of *Die Neue Ordnung,* Walter Ferber as editor of *Föderalistische Hefte*. To take another example, Louis Salleron began his career at the *Action Française*, spent the 1930s as a corporatist in *Jeune Droite* circles, and then became a prominent federalist after World War II. This progression is absolutely typical, and far more representative of European Catholicism as a whole than the Christian Democrats. Christian corporatism did not die after the 1930s—it transformed itself for participation in the Cold War and in European federalism, for which it had unwittingly prepared itself in the 1930s.

---

[7] Valery-Radot, "Eclipse du spirituel," *Revue française* 26 (1932), 54-5. For an Austrian version, see Franz Schillinger, "Demokratisches Erbgut in Oesterreich," *Christliche Ständestaat* 3, 25 (21 June 1935), 584-6

Transnational Formations

Catholic corporatism was, like its counterpart, a transnational phenomenon: to varying degrees, regimes influenced by Catholic social-political thought arose in Spain, Portugal, Austria, Hungary, and (Vichy) France. Catholic economists and social theorists in these places were influenced by one another and self-consciously formed a single, if acephalous, tradition. Gonzague de Reynold, a prominent Swiss Catholic intellectual, had improbably seen the League of Nations as the vessel for Catholic revival in the 1920s. He was still internationally-minded in the 1930s, but the content of the internationalism had changed radically (it also had nothing in common with the parallel movements among civil-society Catholics).

Reynold participated in the rightward shift of the "European idea" of the 1930s. He wrote in furiously anti-Geneva publications of the French *Jeune Droite*. He was, for instance, present at a 1932 conference on the topic hosted by the Royal Academy of Italy: he was joined by figures like Christopher Dawson and Pierre Gaxotte (the premier historian of the *Action Française*).[8] Most importantly, he was brought by the Portuguese state for a visit in 1935, which resulted in a widely-read volume called, simply, *Portugal*. And, to look ahead slightly—in the 1940s he would write in *La Fédération* alongside such status-quo figures as Wilhelm Röpke, the neoliberal economist and father of the social market economy, and the American ambassador to France.[9] Reynold's book on Salazar perfectly encapsulates the new internationalism. It was written by a Swiss, who was brought to Portugal by the state to publish a book in Paris—moreover, if Bernard Fäy is to be believed, it appeared on the desk of General Franco.[10]

---

[8] Philippe Chenaux, *De la chrétienté à l'Europe* (Paris, 2007), 61-2.

[9] Gonzague de Reynold, "La décadence de la civilisation moderne," *Cahiers*, second series, no. 7 (1930), 50-57; *Portugal* (Paris, 1936); "Penser notre temps," *La Fédération* 33 (October 1947)

[10] Barbara Will, *Unlikely Collaboration* (New York, 2011), 246n49

Of course, the role of the Vatican itself should not be forgotten. I will not be dwelling overmuch on Pius XI here: on the ground, neither French nor Catholic corporatists were especially interested in the Vatican, although all parties were glad to have enthusiastic hierarchical support once their movements came to power in 1934 or 1940. While the story differs from country to country, and from bishopric to bishopric, it is largely true that the Vatican and the hierarchy were warmly supportive of Christian corporatism as it developed in Portugal, Spain, Austria, and France. Eugenio Pacelli, then Cardinal Secretary of State, celebrated Dollfuss's May 1934 constitution, and the hierarchy was equally enthusiastic about Salazar's experiments. *Quadragesimo Anno* gave ammunition to corporatists across Europe: in it. Dollfuß's stated mission, for instance, was to construct a society on the basis of *Quadragesimo Anno*: Johannes Messner, who played a role in Dollfuss's government and helped organize Hildebrand's journal, referred to Austria in 1935 as "the first nation in the world that felt called to further the realization of the ideas of *Quadragesimo Anno*."[11]

Quadragesimo Anno is not itself the whole story, though. For one thing, it did not break new ground in any real sense: "The publication of *Quadragesimo Anno*," William Patch has judged, "had little immediate impact on the Christian trade unions throughout Europe, which simply praised the Pope for endorsing principles that they had long followed."[12] For another thing, as we'll see below, corporatism as a major facet of Catholic political culture did not really take off until the mid-1930s, a few years after the encyclical's publication. This culture of corporatism will be our object of analyis, and we will find it in the dense clusters of periodicals that circulated across Europe. Particularly we will be interested here in exchange between French, Austrian, and refugee-German corporatists.

---

[11] Johannes Messner, *Dollfuss* (Inssbruck, 1935), 103.

[12] William Patch, "Fascism, Catholic Corporatism, and the Catholic Trade Unions of Germany, Austria, and France," in *Between Cross and Class: Comparative Histories of Christian Labour in Europe 1840-2000*, ed. Lex Heerma van Voss et al. (New York, 2005), 173-201, here 185.

Their journals were full of one another's works, and articles about the fate of international corporatism. The French, in particular, discovered a newfound sympathy with their Latin-German brothers, menaced by the Nazi onslaught. In 1936, Robert d'Harcourt, Catholic France's most prominent Germanist, explained that "Austria exerts such a great power of attraction on France" because they are spiritual brothers against the Teutons of the North.[13] Just as Fessard encountered Rhenish Catholics in his own visits to Germany, his fellow Jesuit, Pierre Chaillet, spent much of the 1930s living in Austria, which bore fruit in his post-*Anschluss* volume, *L'Autriche souffrante* (1939).

Let's begin with the German refugees and the Austrians. While the last chapter focused on the Rhenish Germans and their exile in Switzerland, this one will focus on the Central European Germans covered in Chapter 2—both those who remained in Austria and those who fled there from Bavaria. Our focus here will be on the circle surrounding Dietrich von Hildebrand, whom we met briefly in Chapter 2, and his journal, *Christliche Ständestaat*. His circle and journal have been judged "perhaps the central group of Catholic-conservative resistance against Nazism outside of Germany—and not only in Austria."[14] He was desperately cosmopolitan—born in Florence to one of nineteenth-century Europe's most famous sculptors—but in the 1920s he made his home primarily in Munich, where he wrote for Bavarian periodicals like *Münchener Neueste Nachrichten* and *Allgemeine Rundschau*. I will focus almost entirely on this journal, both because it was the most prominent intellectual organ of Austrian Catholicism in the 1930s, and because it groomed the next generation of Catholic intellectual heavyweights: Emil Franzel, Eugen Kogon, and Walter Ferber, all of whom were in Hildebrand's circle in the 1930s, would go on to edit three of the most important German-language Catholic periodicals of the postwar period.

---

[13] D'Harcourt, "Österreich und Frankreich," *Christliche Ständestaat* 3, 21 (24 May 1936), 488-90, here 488.

[14] Seefried, *Reich und Stände* 251.

Our exemplary figures from Chapter 2 participated in this movement, as well. Ernst Karl Winter, still wary of the state *qua* anti-Christ, served as vice-mayor of Vienna, drawing on his wartime friendship with Dollfuß (his sharp left turn led to his fall from favor[15]). Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster provides one of the clearest indices of the connections between 1920s Romantic federalism and 1930s corporatism. Although actually located in Switzerland, the best historian of 1930s *Ständestaat* Catholicism has argued that Foerster was the "Kristallationsfigur" of the Austrian emigration: he had, after all, been a professor at the University of Vienna before WWI. He met with Hildebrand in 1933, and was praised in Hildebrand's journal.[16] Moenius himself, one of Foerster's most prominent protégés, was in Austria, too, where he wrote for the same legitimist journal (*Vaterland*) as Hildebrand. Hermann Görgen, one of his students, was set to take the reins of *Christliche Ständestaat* from Hildebrand and Dohrn before the Anschluss hit in 1938.[17]

There were thus myriad links between the legitimist, federalist thought of the 1920s and the personalist, anti-totalitarian defenders of the clerical *Ständestaat*. There were substantial similarities in personnel between *Schönere Zukunft* and *Christliche Ständestaat*, for instance: the two most notable instances were probably Alfred Missong and Eugen Kogon. Missong wrote for *Allgemeine Rundschau* in the 1920s, as did Hildebrand, and served on the editorial board of *Schönere Zukunft*. He also contributed—under pseudonyms—a large number of articles to *Christliche Ständestaat* before enjoying renewed prominence after 1945 as one of the founders of the Oesterrische Volkspartei and editor of its journal. We could also think of Johannes Messner, who began as an editor of the reactionary *Das*

---

[15] Schussnigg himself provides a short account of Winter's career in *The Brutal Takeover*, trans. Richard Barry (New York, 1971), 119-20.

[16] Seefried, *Reich und Stände* 168, 205. The letter to Schuschnigg is reported in Dietrich von Hildebrand, *Memoiren und Aufsätze gegen den Nationalsozialismus, 1933-1938* (Mainz, 1994), ed. Ernst Wenisch, 133. For praise of Förster in *Christliche Ständestaat*, see the account of and selection from his *Europa und die Deutsche Frage* in *Christliche Ständestaat* 4, 28 (18 July 1937), 670-1.

[17] See Seefried, *Reich und Stände* Part III, Chapter 1 on Moenius and Görgen.

Neue Reich, which he took over from Eberle in 1925, before moving into Dollfuss's government and assisting in the organization and funding of *Christliche Ständestaat*: in one of his paeans to Dollfuss, he emphasizes the continuity between Dollfuss and the Austrian, Romantic past, notably Vogelsang and Lueger.[18]

Eugen Kogon will not play a major role in this chapter, although he will re-emerge in Part III. He essentially ceased writing during these years and dedicated himself entirely to anti-Nazi resistance activities. He had, it is woth noting, initially taken a cautiously pro-Nazi line, joining von Papen's *Kreuz und Adler* movement.[19] He soon, though, changed his mind, and entered the busy world of international anti-Nazi activism. He helped to administer the funds provided by Prinz Philipp Josias von Sachsen-Coburg-Gotha, which were used to assist German émigrés and publicize Nazi crimes.[20] Although his initial overtures towards Nazism made Kogon suspect to Hildebrand personally, Kogon was sympathetic to the journal's aims. He congratulated Hildebrand after his meeting with Dollfuß, and eventually became one of the journal's most important financial backers. Kogon doubtless played an essential practical role at the journal: one of the journal's contributors referred in his memoirs to "our most important man, the financial provider Dr. K[ogon]," while in Kogon's own memoirs he emphasizes his assistance to Hildebrand.[21]

---

[18] Messner, *Dollfuss* 103 for the genealogy.

[19] See, for instance, his contribution to Ritter's 1934 volume discussed in the introduction to Part II. He ends his account with a question: "Erfüllt sich jetzt, ein halbes Jahrhundert nach dem Todes des Vorkämpfers, im 'nationalen Sozialismus' was Vogelsang under der Losung 'christlicher Sozialismus' heißen Herzens und voll Liebe zum Vaterland angestrebt hat?" Kogon, "Karl Emil Freiherr von Vogelsang," in *Katholischkonservatives Erbgut* (1934), 351-8, here 355 (this is the end of Kogon's section; the rest of the essay is comprised of sections from Vogelsant)

[20] Seefried, *Reich und Stände* 205.

[21] Hildebrand, *Memoiren und Aufsätze gegen den Nationalsozialismus, 1933-1938,* 146; Alice von Hildebrand, *The Soul of a Lion* 257. Emil Franzel, *Gegen den Wind der Zeit* (Munich, 1983), 308.

Austrian corporatists were attuned to the new importance of their system, and they consistently praised the corporatism of Mussolini and Salazar.[22] They were less keen, however, on German exiles in the civil-society tradition. Polemics occasionally erupted between the two groups of German refugees, who had cold and somewhat distant relationships with one another. Johannes Oesterreicher, in a letter to Thieme, comically criticized *Schönere Zukunft*: "God willing," he exclaimed, "it won't be our *Zukunft*!"[23] As an example of this, we might consider the differences between two of the major Catholic refugee voices of the 1930s: Waldemar Gurian's *Deutsche Briefe* and Dietrich von Hildebrand's *Christliche Ständestaat*. The former, recall, was Gurian's anti-totalitarian organ, published in Switzerland. The latter, which will be a major source for this chapter, was a pro-Dollfuß journal, published in Austria and staffed primarily by German refugees.[24] *Deutsche Briefe* was, above all, an anti-totalitarian journal squarely in the civil society tradition. Its goal was to publicize the persecution of the Church in Nazi Germany, and it avoided positive political theorizing—this not due to a lack of imagination, but due to a certain understanding of the role of the Catholic intellectual, as we saw in the last chapter. *Christliche Ständestaat*, while equally anti-Nazi (its major goal, and the reason it was funded by Dollfuß, was anti-Anschluss agitation), opposed Hitler in a different way. As the name of the journal implies, its anti-totalitarianism was closely linked with a positive political program: the Christian *Ständestaat*, or Christian corporatism.[25]

---

[22] For back-to-back examples, see Wilhelm Böhm, "Faschismus," *Christliche Ständestaat* 4, 27 (11 June 1937), 640-2; Nikolaus Dohrn, "Oliveira Salazar," *Christliche Ständestaat* 4, 27 (11 June 1937), 642-3.

[23] Oesterreicher to Thieme, 13 March 1939, Nachlaß Thieme, Box 163, Folder 60.

[24] Although not the only group of Catholic refugees active in 1930s Austria, it was the most important, and most representative, one. See Seefried, *Reich und Stände*, Part III, Chapter 1.

[25] These two terms do not entirely overlap, and some French corporatists—notably Perroux—wanted to distinguish *corporatisme* from *Ständestaat*. But these fine distinctions belonged to the world of intra-corporatist polemic, and for my purposes, they are close enough; as we will see, *corporatisme* and *Ständestaat* were bound by a whole complex of theological and social assumptions.

The fact that there was very little collaboration between these two stridently anti-Nazi journals is surprising, and Rudolf Ebneth has absurdly claimed that it can be chalked up to pride on the part of *Christliche Ständestaat*.[26] The real reason is, as I have intimated, the radically different intellectual cultures pervading the two journals. "Since I read [Hildebrand's] wretched book on Dollfuß," Thieme wrote to a friend in 1936, "I've wanted nothing to do with this 'Hyper-Austrian': the ordinary Austrians are troublesome enough for me."[27] The disappointment was mutual: Klaus Dohrn, *Christliche Ständestaat*'s co-editor, had despised one of Gurian's only contributions.[28] Balduin Schwarz was thus correct when he wrote to Gurian that the sticking point between the two journals was the inveterate support for the federalist, Austrian idea at Hildebrand's journal, which clashed with Gurian's sensibility.[29]

There was, however, significant cooperation with the French corporatists. This can be seen through the career of François Perroux, plausibly referred to in an American journal as "the most lucid and withal the most comprehensive analyst of European corporativism."[30] A professor of political economy in Lyon, a seedbed of social Catholicism, he came to Paris to assume a law professorship in 1935. Like other corporatists, he was fed up with party politics and threw himself behind various third-way movements; eventually, he would become one of the chief economists and policymakers of the Vichy régime. Perroux's imagination was always international in scope. With

---

[26] Rudolf Ebneth, *Die österreichische Wochenschrift* Der Christliche Ständestaat*, deutsche Emigration in Österreich 1933-1938* (Mainz, 1976), 77n.

[27] Karl Thieme to H.A. Reinhold, 29 February 1936, Folder 163/65, Nachlaß Thieme.

[28] Balduin Schwarz reported this to Gurian in a letter of 9 September 1936, Box 7, Folder 16, Gurian Papers.

[29] Schwarz was friendly with both of them and desperately wanted Gurian and Hildebrand to collaborate—as it is, the only extant correspondence between the two are a few coldly formal letters. Schwarz to Gurian, 20 February 1935, Box 7, Folder 16, Gurian Papers.

[30] Paul Vignaux, "Corporatism in Europe," *The Review of Politics* 4, 2 (April 1942), 194-205, here 197. Antonin Cohen and Jean-Pierre Le Crom agree on this.

fund from the Rockefeller Foundation, he had studied in Vienna, particularly with Joseph Schumpeter. He was a reader of *Christliche Ständestaat*, and drew on it in his own writings on the corporate state. Like others at the time, Perroux was particularly impressed by Portugal, and he devoted a section of his 1938 book, called "Salazarean State and Totalitarian State," to demonstrating that Salazar's corporatism, however imperfect, was not totalitarian and remained infused by the doctrines and morals of social Catholicism.[31]

Although Perroux remained personally aloof from most of their efforts, his closest theoretical allies were to be found in the *Jeune Droite*, and he would soon join them in Pétain's regime.[32] They were broadly continuous with the Maurrassean Catholics discussed in Chapter 1. Nicolas Kessler, who has expanded the history of the Jeune Droite beyond the temporal confines suggested by Loubet del Bayle's classic account, has attempted to "resituate the history of the Jeune Droite in the larger story of the Action française."[33] The main Jeune Droite activist that I will discuss in this chapter, Jean de Fabrègues, we have already met in Chapter 1 as a Thomist student of Gilson, leader in the Camelots du Roi, and popularizer of Cochin in *La Gazette française*, a Maurras- and Maritain-inspired journal. He remained loyal to Maurras after 1926, and briefly served as his personal secretary. Throughout the 1930s, he was involved with a great number of journals, of which he was indefatigable as founder and editor: the most significant were *Revue française*, *Réaction pour l'ordre*, *La*

---

[31] Ibid. 109ff.

[32] Although Perroux occasionally wrote for *Esprit*, Fabrègues was quick to explain this away. Fabrègues, "Corporatisme devant l'Etat," *Combat* 3, 22 (February 1938), unpaginated, for his discussion of Perroux. See Jean-Pierre Le Crom, *Syndicats, nous voilà!* (Paris, 1995), 74 for Perroux and the Popular Front.

[33] Nicolas Kessler, *Histoire politique de la Jeune Droite* (Paris, 2001), 21.

Revue du siècle, *La revue du Xxème siècle*, *Combat,* and *Civilisation*. These journals will provide the major source base for the discussion of Fabrègues and his circle.[34]

Just as the French civil-society Catholics were in dialogue with the Rhenish exile, the French corporatist catalogs were in dialogue with the Austrians and Foerster. Figures like Foerster and Moenius were invisible in the civil-society publications of Bernadot: as his Dominican publishing empire was designed primarily to counter the dominant Maurrasean voice in French Catholic life, they restricted themselves to anti-Maurras German Catholics like Landsberg, Gurian, and Platz. The Austrian corporatists, however, were a major presence in *Jeune Droite* journals: when Jean de Fabrègues's *Réaction pour l'Ordre* decided to include Germans in their "Enquête sur l'Ordre", they bypassed the whole Rhineland tradition and sent requests to Foerster and Moenius; in his response, Foerster was sure to praise Maurras's healthy, Roman nationalism.[35] In another of Fabrègues's journals, Foerster was praised, in a hagiographic article, as an "apostle of moderation and of Christian morality."[36] There were multiple articles in Jeune Droite journals defending Austria as the last holdout of truly Latin culture, defined, as in Massis, by alliance between Roman religion and political authority.[37] Moenius was the translator of Massis's own work, and was celebrated in the Jeune Droite press for that reason. One further example: when Perroux describes Catholic

---

[34] The source base will be less rich here than in other chapters; archival sources have proven hard to come by. "The 'Jeune Droite'," a friend wrote to Jean de Fabrègues in 1938, "is distinguished by many virtues and qualities, but it does not seem to possess that of … responding to letters!" Alexandre Marc to Fabrègues, 1 July 1938, AM-123, Fonds Alexandre Marc.

[35] Magniez, "Entretien avec le Professeur Fr. W. Foerster," *Réaction pour l'Ordre* 2, 5 (February 1931), 16-21. Maurras is discussed on page 19. The article from Moenius was announced but, for some reason, never published.

[36] O. Scheid, review of Foerster, *L'Europe et la Question allemande*, *Civilisation* 1, 2 (May 1938), 21-3, here 21.

[37] See, for instance, F.G., "Nécessité de l'Autriche-Hongrie", *Combat* 3, 22 (February 1938) or Pierre Lafue, "Ou en est la restauration des Habsbourg?" *1934* 2, 35 (4 June 1934), 3. See also Robert de Traz, "Vienne la Rouge," *1934* 2, 41 (18 July 1934), 3, in which Dollfuß is called "one of the most astonishing pesonalities of our times", and is praised as a Catholic and patriot. *Credo,* the journal of the FNC (with which Fabrègues and other Jeune Droite personalities were loosely linked), also celebrated the Christian corporatism of the Austrian state, particularly pointing out its federalism and corporatism. A. Robinet de Cléry, "L'Etat corporatif chrétien dans l'Autriche nouvelle," *Credo* 110 (March 1935), 31-43.

Germany, he focuses solely on the South. "The Catholic style of life," he writes, "blossoms in the south, particularly in Bavaria."[38] Like other French corporatists, he ignores the civil-society traditions of the Rhineland.

Louis Le Fur, one of interwar France's most celebrated international lawyers, is an exemplary figure of the rapprochement between the two Catholic corporatisms. He owed his job at the University of Paris to Action Française agitation on his behalf in 1925 (the university had first proposed Georges Scelle, deemed insufficiently conservative by the royalist student *Ligues* then pre-eminent in the Latin quarter).[39] In the 1930s, he published in both Fabrègues's *Jeune Droite* journals and in *Christliche Ständestaat* (one of few French authors to do so).[40] He also traveled through Austria with Wladimir d'Ormesson in 1936, who wrote about their trip in a series of articles in *Le Figaro*. These articles were celebrations of Austria's *Ständestaat* and the nation's central role in any stable European peace; these articles were, in turn, celebrated back in *Christliche Ständestaat*, particularly d'Ormesson's declaration that Dollfuss was "the true spiritual hero of our time."[41] He then, like so many other Maurrasean corporatists, went on to support Vichy; in particular, he was, like Perroux, linked with *L'Institut d'études corporatives et sociales*, which Le Fur had helped found in 1934, and which threw itself behind Pétain.

---

[38] François Perroux, *Les mythes hitlériens* (Lyon, 1935), 76.

[39] On *L'affaire Scelle*, see Martti Koskenniemi, *The Gentle Civilizer of Nations* (New York, 2002), 316ff.

[40] Louis Le Fur, "Der Frieden der Völker und die Achtung der Verträge," *Christliche Ständestaat* 3, 31 (2 August 1936), 728-32; for his articles in Jeune Droite journals see, among others, Louis le Fur, "Sur les fondements du Droit," *Civilisation* 1, 3 (June 1938), 14-16.

[41] --, "Französische Sondernummern des 'Christlichen Ständestaat," *Christliche Ständestaat* 3, 31 (2 August 1936), 744-5. The "true spiritual hero" quotation appears in its own inset box in *Christliche Ständestaat* 4, 29 (25 July 37), 698

Corporatism in Context

So there were two competing internationalisms within 1930s Catholicism: on the one hand, civil-society Catholics, primarily in France and Switzerland, publishing in Father Bernadot's Dominican journals. On the other hand, corporatist Catholics, primarily in France and Austria, publishing in *Christliche Ständestaat* and in Fabrègues's constellation of *Jeune Droite* journals. Conflicts occasionally broke out between the two: we have already seen the friction between Gurian's and Hildebrand's exile-circles. A *Jeune Droite* journal condemned Mounier's journal as "unreadable."[42] More significantly, there were various wars of manifestoes, most notably that over the Abyssinian invasion canvassed in the introduction to Part II. We have, in addition, already seen Maritain's anti-Dollfuß manifesto. And, to review : the primary battle was not over *which* politics to support, but over political engagement *as such*. The corporatist Catholics firmly believed in it. "The parliamentary state," Perroux wrote in 1938, "is no longer adapted to the needs of the economy."[43] And here's Gonzague de Reynold, in a 1936 speech delivered in Portugal: "I do not say 'politique d'abord'. But I do say 'politics at the same time.'"[44] The corporatists were clear that this political bent set them at odds with the civil-society Catholics. Roger Manaud, who provided the main *Jeune Droite* response to Maritain's *Pour le bien commun*, complained that its authors "go so far as to suppress politics, in seeing in it no more than a branch of morality."[45] The State, Hildebrand held, was "God's proxy."[46]

Corporatism was Catholicism's entry into the various planned-economy schemes that swept across Europe in the 1930s in response to economic depression. The best known of these came

[42] --, "Esprit!", *Revue du Siècle* 1, 6 (October 1933), 103.

[43] Perroux, *Capitalisme et communauté de travail* 172-3.

[44] Gonzague de Reynold, *L'Europe Tragique* (Paris, 1936), 35.

[45] Roger Manaud, "Sur le bien commun," *Revue du Xxème Siècle* 1 (November 1934), 34-8, here 35.

[46] Quoted Seefried, *Reich und Stände* 232.

from the neo-socialist Henri de Man, who enjoyed a vogue in French Catholic circles.[47] Across Europe, these figures advocated some kind of *planisme* as an antidote to the obvious failures of capitalism. The Parti social français and the Croix de feu, for all of their staunch traditionalism, were caught up in these modern schemes; as Samuel Kalman has shown, there were debates at the heart of these institutions between Americanizing modernizers and traditional defenders of the artisan.[48] The Catholics I will discusss here were in the same general *milieu* as the technocratic planners of *X-Crise* and the mystical ideals of Teilhard de Chardin and Alexis Carrel. "Recent contacts," Jean Coutrot wrote, "have shown me that French Catholic thought, after two thousand years of evolution, has arrived at the exact same conclusions we engineers have arrived at, reasoning on a purely objective basis."[49] I should be clear, though, that I am not fundamentally interested in the technocrats at the heights: these have been ably studied by Philip Nord (and Kalman) already. Instead, I will be attempting to evaluate the broader political culture of corporatist Catholicism: the one that would allow those technocrats to legitimate their power after the war.

Corporatism was a contested concept in the mid-1930s. Franz von Papen and the circle around *Zeit und Volk*, for instance, were corporatists in the name of National Socialism, while Hildebrand and the *Christliche Ständestaat* circle supported an authoritarian, anti-Nazi corporatism.[50] The battle over corporatism, though, was between authoritarianisms: it almost never countenanced liberal democracy, and Nazi corporatism was strangled at birth. [51] Most members of the Jeune

---

[47] Ze'ev Sternhell, *Neither Right nor Left,* trans D. Maisel (Princeton, 1983), chs. 4-5.

[48] Samuel Kalman, *The Extreme Right in Interwar France* (Burlington, 2008), ch. 2.

[49] Quoted Philip Nord, *France's New Deal* 57.

[50] Seefried, *Reich und Stände* 125. For a similar case, see Luca Nogler, "Corporatist Doctrine and the 'New European Order'", in *Darker Legacies of Law in Europe*, ed. Christian Joerges and Navraj Singh Ghaleigh (Portland, 2003), 275-304.

[51] J.T. Delos, Eugène Duthoit, and the *Semaines Sociales de France*, which hosted a study week on corporatism in 1935, are indicative of the political multivalence of the theory. In a number of articles, Delos praised the corporatist achievements

Droite, it was reported in 1933, saw an inextricable link between capitalism and democracy, and every tentatively democratic article in 1930s Austria was counterbalanced by many more claiming that only the monarchy could defend a Christian state.[52] As one politician wrote in Hildebrand's journal in December 1934:

> In democracy, where the sovereign people rules, the government is put under the people's control; it cannot lead, the end is chaos. In a dictatorship, the government commands a lawless Volk. In the corporative order [ständischen Ordnung], the government leads a free Volk.[53]

A French corporatist in the same year concurred: "Aren't democracy and étatisme intimately linked?"[54] For both the writer and most of his corporatist colleagues, the answer was yes. "France is a nation that naturally requires a monarchy," wrote Louis Salleron.[55]

Quadregesimo Anno (1931), the monumental encyclical released on the fortieth anniversary of Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum*, re-emphasized the Vatican's commitment to corporatism. As we saw in the last chapter, the Church was careful to remain neutral in most political conflicts, and thus maintain its zealously-guarded apolitical stance. On the other hand, corporatist Catholics could point to the encyclical as proof of papal support. Pius XI lauded the "true Catholic social science" that had

---

of Dollfuss, and while he had his doubts about Pétain, he praised Pétain's principles and was not at all part of the Resistance (although he signed the 1942 anti-totalitarian manifesto, we will see in this chapter that there was no contradiction between anti-totalitarian personalism and support for Vichy). On the other hand, he was a strong supporter of international law and a sharp critic of Mussolini's actions in Abyssinia (although he did not sign Maritain's civil-society manifesto). Delos, "Coup d'oeil sur les idéologies régnantes en matière d'organisation corporative: Leurs principes directeurs, leur faiblesse," in *L'organisation corporative* (Angers, 1935), 305-30. On Delos and Vichy, see Auguste Viatte, *D'un monde à l'autre*, Vol. I, ed. Claude Hauser (Montreal, 2001), 331n.

[52] Daniel Rops, "Positions générales," *Revue française* 28 (1933), 489-97. He was reporting on the February 1933 meeting of the Union pour la vérité, which had brought together the most prominent non-conformists of the time. See Kessler, *Histoire politique de la Jeune Droite* 219 on this. For Austria, see Viktor Frankl, "Christlicher Ständestaat und legitime Monarchie," *Christliche Ständestaat* 3, 9 (1 March 1936), 201-5; Nikolaus Dohrn, "Legitimismus und politischer Katholizismus," *Christliche Ständestaat* 2, 36 (8 September 1935), 861-4

[53] Legationsrat a.D. Georg Reininghaus, "Demokratie, Diktatur und berufsständische Ordnung," *Christliche Ständestaat* 1, 55 (23 December 1934), 4-5, here 4.

[54] P. de Gascherau, "Le Nombre et l'Etat," *Revue du Siècle* 1, 7 (November 1933), 48-54, here 50

[55] Salleron, "Quelles pourraient-être les institutions politiques de la France?", *Combat* 4, 34 (April 1939), non-paginated.

arisen. "There resides in Us," he added, "the right and duty to pronounce with supreme authority upon social and economic matters." And pronounce he did, drawing on the Church's corporatist traditions. He also directly addresssed the State, reiterating that the Church is indifferent to political form, but is committed to reducing the "almost infinite tasks and duties" that have been piled upon it, in ignorance of its limited, natural role in the conomy.[56]

At the level of political culture, corporatism did not coalesce as an international phenomenon until the mid-1930s, alongside civil-society Catholicism. As Marcel Prélot suggested in February 1935, "among the events that marked 1934, there is one in particular that should be noted by the historian of ideas: the renaissance of the term, and the idea, of the 'corporative.'"[57] Although he was somewhat over-optimistic about the perspicuity of future intellectual historians, the evidence bears him out. What seems to have happened is that, after the Stavisky riots, the failure of Maurrass's *Politique, d'abord!* strategy became apparent. As Dollfuß came to power and war began in Spain, Maurras's obsession with poetry, Provençal, and the Bourbons came to seem increasingly outdated. The new world belonged not to Taine, but to de Man. Jean de Fabrègues, along with others, determined that a change in language was necessary. "Neither this country, nor its political institutions, nor its social body," Fabrègues wrote to a friend, "would be remade with only phrases and the evocation of a political structure. We must trace, once again, the substance of an organic society." Thus far, of course, he had not moved beyond Maurras. "But," he continued, "I no longer think, if I ever did, that we find ourselves faced with a purely political problem." This is a

[56] *Quadragesimo Anno*, paragraphs 20, 41, 80.

[57] Marcel Prelot, "Le Corporatisme italien," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 34, 1 (25 February 35), 107-119, here 107. There is controversy over the exact date of the corporatist renaissance in France: Prélot and Mounier date it to 1934, the historian Jean-Pierre Le Crom dates it to 1935, while Fabrègues himself later claimed that it began in 1936. It was, in any case, a phenomenon of the mid-1930s. -- [presumably Mounier], "Duplicités du Corporatisme," *Esprit* 2, 23 (September 1934), 711-12, here 711; Le Crom, *Syndicats, nous voilà!*, 59ff; Fabrègues, "Le corporatisme devant l'Etat," op. cit. There were precursors in the pre-'34 Jeune Droite, of course: see, for instance, Christian Chenut, "Finance ou Production?", *Cahiers* 3, 10 (March 1932), 37-47.

monumental declaration, coming from a former secretary of Maurras. Citing the authority of Perroux, Fabrègues explained his belief that a new solution must move beyond "politique d'abord" and embrace the economy: in other words, we must become corporatist.[58]

One way to track this new interest in the economic sphere among the French right is to look at *Courrier Royal* in 1934-5. The journal housed a number of royalists, including Fabrègues, who had broken with Maurras and his whole approach: the Comte de Paris was endorsed by the four premier figures of the Jeune Droite in a January 1935 manifesto.[59] Whereas Maurras's journals focused on questions of sovereignty and metaphysics, as we saw in Chapter 1, the new legitimism was stridently corporatist, exercised primarily by proletarianization and the new economic regime to be underwritten by the restored Comte de Paris. "The economic and political regimes of a nation," wrote a supporter in 1934, "are interdependent. Corporatism is not realizable in a democracy."[60]

"A non-Marxist anti-capitalism," wrote one of Fabrègues's colleagues, "can be founded on a long Christian tradition."[61] This declaration is found in the Jeune Droite's immediate response to the Stavisky riots: a Spring 1934 celebration in Fabrègues *Revue du Siècle* of La Tour du Pin's centenary, replete with articles updating the master's insights for a France in crisis. In his opening essay, Fabrègues emphasized that the crisis was not, in the first instance, a crisis of democracy, but of capitalism.[62] The contributors' solution, likewise, was not traditionalist royalism, but economic corporatism: Roman Dmowski, the Polish Maurrassean leader, contributed a long essay on the

---

[58] Jean de Fabrègues to Alexander Marc, undated [probably July 1938], AM-123, Fonds Alexandre Marc.

[59] Jean de Fabrègues, Robert Francis, Jean Maxence, Thierry-Maulnier, "Une politique vivante," *Revue du Xxème siècle* 3 (January 1935), 3-6.

[60] Anonymous, "Les Lois Sociales et la Corporation," *Courrier Royal* 1, 1 (10 December 1934), 16. For another example, see Anonymous, "La corporation rehabilitera le travail," *Courrier Royal* 1, 2 (10 January 1935), 2.

[61] Jacques Saint-Germain, "Le Banqueroute du capitalisme," *Revue du Siècle* 2, 11-12 (March-April 1934), 13-25, here 13.

[62] Jean de Fabrègues, "Prendre parti, mais reconstruire," *Revue du Siècle* 2, 11-12 (March-April 1934), 1-5.

nature of the crisis, and Pierre Lucius, an early corporatist, wrote about the Italian regime as a model corporative state. The centerpiece, finally, was Roger Magniez's article, "Towards a corporatist doctrine."[63]

The corporatist revival was part of the same anti-Front moment as civil-society Catholicism; if anything, corporatist Catholics were even more scathing towards Blum and the idea of collaboration with socialism than were their civil-society adversaries. The corporatist Jean-François Gravier, who would rocket to prominence after World War II as the author of *Paris et le désert français* (1947), began writing for Jeune Droite journals: "Any entente whatsoever between Catholics and Marxists," he wrote in one of them, "is scandalous *from the beginning* because Marxism is the direct antithesis of Christianity."[64] The National Front, the Right's answer to the Popular Front, enshrined corporatism in its 1934 manifesto.[65] An editorial in *Credo*, the journal of the FNC and a central organ of 1930s Catholic corporatism, spoke for many when it proclaimed, "The *Popular Front* is first and foremost the *Secular Front* [Front laïque]."[66] The corporatists simply believed that something more full-blooded would be necessary to combat the Bolshevik menace: "Communism or corporatism: that is the question," wrote the Catholic corporatist Paul Chanson in 1937.[67]

The major corporatist theorists for the Jeune Droite were Pierre Lucius, François Perroux, and Louis Salleron. As Fabrègues pointed out in his review, Perroux's 1938 work—among the most

---

[63] Roman Dmowski, "La Nature de la Crise," 26-38; Pucius, "La Charte du travail du troisième Reich," 47-60 (49 on Italian fascism); Roger Magniez, "Vers une doctrine corporativ," 61-89 (all in Ibid.).

[64] Emphasis in original. Jean-François Gravier, "Les catholiques et le Front populaire," *L'Insurgé* 1, 18 (12 May 1937), 8.

[65] This is discused in Jacques Saint Germain, "Vers la Corporation," *Revue du Xxème Siècle* 1 (November 1934), 49-52. For instance, the F.N.C. had a two-day conference in October 1936 devoted to their two tasks: first, "La lutte contre le communisme" and second, "la rénovation corporative." As the speeches make clear, these were seen as the same thing. "La lutte contre le communisme, la rénovation corporative," *Credo* 128 (November 1936), 9-29.

[66] Charles Bénard, "Le Front Populaire," *Credo* 121 (March 1936), 7-12, here 9.

[67] "Communisme ou corporatisme: voilà la question." Paul Chanson, *Communisme ou corporatisme?* (Paris, 1937), 1.

influential texts of the period (and one to which we will return in more detail in the next section)—can be read as a translation of Maurrasean political insights into an updated methodological language: bringing Maurras's fear of abstraction and parliament out of the world of politics and metaphysics and into the social sciences. Perroux's disaster-theory of modernity is, essentially, the same as Maurras's: they both believed that France's golden age had been the pre-absolutist monarchy, and that the absolutist monarchy and the revolution were the direct outcome of the breakdown of that order. But for Perroux, this catastrophe was fundamentally economic in nature. It was not the breakdown of authority as such, but rather the polarization of society into two antagonistic classes: workers and capitalists. Like Kogon before him, Perroux complains that the cooperative estates of medieval Europe had given way to antagonistic, artificial classes. This has only been exacerbated since the late nineteenth century, which has seen the development of monopolies and syndicates. Early political economy, Perroux argues, had been predicated on the belief in a large number of equal producers; the necessity of fixed capital (factories, etc.) in a mature capitalist economy had rendered this assumption invalid.

Only a return to the corporation could stave off economic collapse and revolutionary violence. Perroux defines the corporation as

> a group of public or semi-public character in which bosses and workers are equally represented, and in which the state will decide in case of conflict. It fixes the prices of goods and services (incomes) with an authoritarian voice, instead of letting them establish themselves through the play of the free market.[68]

These groups, defined by nature and not through class antagonism, become the true agents of social reproduction. For Perroux, the individual matters insofar as he plays his role in a corporation. This deserves judicial recognition, and he suggests that the "rights of man and citizen" be replaced by the

[68] Perroux, *Capitalisme et communauté de travail* 18.

"rights of the group": this is "a modernized and enriched form of the declaration of the rights of man."[69]

Much of this does not seem new to us, and in Fabrègues's review he made it clear that Perroux was drawing on a longer tradition of Catholic anti-Jacobinism and anti-étatisme more broadly. But one word in the previous quotation should give us pause: "modernized." Perroux is illustrative of a general trend in mid-1930s French Catholicism to find new solutions to new problems as Maurras's royalism came to seem outdated. Specifically, Perroux and his corporatist colleagues were willing to envision an expanded role for the state in economic life. For Maurras, recall, the state was defined primarily by its retreat from economic and social life: the essence of the political was in the realm of foreign affairs and law enforcement, and any expansion of the state was read as pathology.

For Perroux, the state apparatus had, in the medieval corporatist order, kept itself abstract from the economy. It was responding to the economic state of affairs: the corporations remained intact without government oversight (i.e. they had not split into warring classes) and the rise of fixed capital had not fomented monopoly capitalism.[70] But we are beyond that now: we live in a world of heavy industry and class conflict, in which, as seen already in Perroux's definition of the corporation, the state will sometimes have to intervene. The "work community," which would be the name for the new corporations, would be expected to work out conflicts on its own, but everything would be overseen by the state. "The work community is, finally, relatively independent from nationalization.

[69] Ibid. 267.

[70] Ibid. 21.

It supposes that the accent is not placed on the existence, importance, and extension of the public, socialized sector but on the control and regulation of the entire economy."[71]

When Perroux looked around Europe, he felt particularly encouraged by developments in Portugal and Austria: he praised, in particular, the corporatist ideas of the *Christliche Ständestaat* circle, of which he was a reader.[72] The new right-wing of the 1930s, in response to economic collapse, had, Perroux correctly noted, moved *en masse* towards corporatist solutions as a way to rein in free-market excesses without lending blanket authority to the sinister forces of monopoly capitalism. In 1933 and 1934, Mussolini announced new corporatist initiatives in Italy, causing great excitement in continental Catholic journals. Although Salazar had been implementing corporatist ideas for some time, they received new prominence in France through the writings of Gonzague de Reynold, J.T. Delos, and Perroux himself. In Spain, José Antonio Primo de Rivera and his Falange published their corporatist manifesto in January 1935.[73]

It was Austria, however, that most piqued Perroux's interest, and not only because he had been trained there. Austria experienced a revival of corporatist theory *and* practice. In theory, this had been going on for some time: in Chapter 2, we examined the corporatist sociology at work in Central Europe in the 1920s. This continued apace throughout the late 1920s and early 1930s. We might look, for example, at a "Catholic-Social Manifesto" released by a group of Catholic sociologists in Vienna in 1932. Capitalism, they plausibly argued, was collapsing, which left only corporatism and Communism as viable options. Drawing on *Quadrageismo Anno*, they claimed that corporatism provided a way out of "the double chaos of capitalism and Communo-socialism." The

---

[71] Ibid. 307.

[72] Ibid., Chapter IV (see source-list for his reliance on Hildebrand's journal).

[73] Stanley Payne, "Spain," in *The European Right*, ed. Hans Rogger and Eugen Weber (Berkeley, 1965), 168-208, here 195.

manifesto has an interesting relation to Catholic Action: they definitely speak its language ("no city, no village without Catholic-Social groups!"), but the occasion for the manifesto was a Catholic Action congress in 1929 that the sociologists deemed insufficiently radical. No specific stateform is necessarily called for by the corporate order." Two kinds, however, are explicitly *not* allowed: the first is "party-'democracy"' and the second is dictatorship."[74] Only the *ständische* Ordnung would do. When Dollfuß came to power, they were ready.

As with Fabrègues, Hildebrand's journey towards these ideas was a long one: he had been essentially apolitical throughout the 1920s, imbibing and teaching Scheler's personalism in Munich without directly applying them to political realities. He was primarily interested in marriage and the family: in one of his many writings on the subject, Hildebrand summarized his view of marriage as highest, closest, and most profound natural community of love [Liebesgemeinschaft]."[75] This changed in 1929, when he entered the fray of political theory with an essay about Carl Schmitt's *Concept of the Political*. Unsurprisingly, Hildebrand held that Schmitt's reduction of the political to the friend/enemy grouping was dangerous and heretical. Like Roger Manaud a few years later, Hildebrand argued that politics and ethics are inextricably bound together: the realm of the state and of law cannot be abandoned by the Catholic to the forces of secularism. One of Hildebrand's strongest claims against Schmitt, and one familiar to us from chapter 2, is that he had neglected to understand power as the province of a set of overlapping, legitimate institutions. "The individual," Hildebrand emphasizes, "is not a citizen in the first instance!" A society is meaningful to the extent

---

[74] *Katholische-soziales Manifest*, ed. Studienrunde katholischer Soziologen (Mainz, 1932), 8-9, 54. Corporatism was flourishing in the Rhineland, too, although the events of 1933 ensured that these voices did not participate in international debate. See, for instance, *Die berufsständische Ordnung*, ed. Josef van der Velden (Köln, 1932); *Die Essener Richtlinien 1933* (Berlin, 1933).

[75] Hildebrand, "Lambeth Botschaft," *Religiöse Besinnung* 4, 1 (1931), 20-9, here 21.

that it allows the human person to develop towards God, and other communities—notably the family—are far more successful at this than the state.[76]

In the early 1930s, Hildebrand turned towards corporatism. In 1933, soon before his emigration, he published an essay called "The Corporative Idea and the Natural Communities."[77] His ideas naturally led him to support Austria's experiment, and when he was forced into exile he ended up in Vienna. He soon gained an audience with Dollfuß himself, who agreed to fund his journal in an effort to counterbalance the influence of *Schönere Zukunft*, which Dollfuß felt to be too *gesamtdeutsch* in orientation, and not sufficiently dedicated to the Austrian corporatist experiment.[78] Dohrn, Hildebrand's relative and coeditor, was opposed to the new journal's name, which he felt sounded too fascist: it was Hildebrand who agitated for it (Dohrn, who had served as the Rome correspondent for the *Rhein-Mainische Volkszeitung*, had a somewhat different sensibility from Hildebrand).

The journal can best be read as a translation of Hildebrand's personalist theories of the family into the realm of politics. "The family," wrote one contributor, "enjoys special protection as the germ cell of the state." The family should not be overcome, as in the Marxist state, or "encapsulated by the great society," as in National Socialism.[79] But, as in France, political realities forced intellectuals beyond traditionalist defenses of the family and towards more full-blooded political theories. Whereas this article, ten years earlier, might have ended with a simple lament that the liberal state was incapable of recognizing legitimate paternal authority, the author now goes further

---

[76] Dietrich von Hildebrand, "Zur Begrenzung des Staates," in *Zeitliches in Lichte des Weigen* (1932) 187-200, here 193, 197-8. This was originally published in *Der Friedenskämpfer* (5. Jahrgang, 1929, Nr. 1)

[77] Hildebrand, "Die Korporative Idee und die Natürlichen Gemeinschaften," *Der katholische Gedanke* 6, 1 (1933), 48-58.

[78] Ebneth, *Die österreichische Wochenschrift* Der Christliche Ständestaat 11.

[79] Karl Gustav Bittner, "Katholizismus gegen Kapitalismus," *Christliche Ständestaat* 2, 23 (9 June 1935), 541-4, here 544.

and discusses the need for a corporatist organization of the professions. "The state," wrote the secretary of Dollfuss's political party in Hildebrand's journal, "is fundamentally a great family, which is unified through ethical norms, defined ideals, and a political idea."[80] Hildebrand agreed, writing that the purpose of his journal was to defend "the Christian idea of the state" against the neo-paganism of Bolshevism and Nazism; Hildebrand emphasized throughout the 1930s that the state, as one natural community among many, was no less exempt from Christian values than the family, corporation, or church.[81] "The higher the domain of value," Hildebrand wrote, "the deeper the stratum in the person to which it beckons, and the more it addresses itself not only to the individual, but rather to the community [Gemeinschaft]."[82]

He clarified the relation between his personalist theories of the family and his corporatism in a 1935 article entitled, simply, "State and Marriage." He begins by attacking the common belief that, in a well-organized society, "the greater and more capacious society incorporates the smaller as an element of itself." Like Guardini ten years earlier, Hildebrand argued that each society—the family, the clan, the nation, and so on—should retain its independence, and that none of them could be definitely absorbed by the others without violence to human nature. "Marriage," Hildebrand writes, "is certainly the basis and origin of the family, but it is neither identical with the family, nor is it completely incorporated into it, as a part into a whole."[83] The same is true, he continues, of marriage and the state: marriage does not resolve into the state, and thus the state has no right to interfere

---

[80] Walter Adam [General secretary of the Vaterländische Front], "Notwendigkeit und Grenzen staatlicher Werbung," *Christliche Ständestaat* 1, 55 (23 December 1934), 5-6, here 5.

[81] Dietrich von Hildebrand, "Weihnachten 1934," *Christliche Ständestaat* 1, 55 (23 December 1934), 3-4, here 3; Hildebrand, "Die sittliche Grundlagen der Völkergemeinschaft," in *Zeitliches in Lichte des Ewigen*, *op cit.*, 201-22, here 204-5.

[82] Hildebrand, "Die Korporative Idee und die Natürlichen Gemeinschaften," op. cit., 56

[83] Hildebrand, "Staat und Ehe," *Christliche Ständestaat* 2, 42 (20 Okt 1935), 1002-4.

with the marriage bond: the marriage and the state are two communities out of many, and the political sovereign has no more right to interfere with the family than does each individual family to interfere in foreign affairs. The state, Hildebrand concludes, "is a natural community among others, and not the highest."[84] It was this naturalness of the state as a community—which, per Catholic doctrines of nature, rooted the state in God—that so distinguished corporatist from civil-society Catholicism. Neither Gurian, Landsberg, Fessard or Maritain would say, with Johannes Messner, that the contemporary challenge was a "struggle for a return to the natural principles of a true national community [Volksgemeinschaft]."[85]

The state, no less than the family, should disavow any forms of legitimacy that are not based on natural law, most notably democracy. "[T]he state, in the Christian sense, exhibits an authoritarian structure," because political authority is not properly the "will of the majority" in Rousseau's sense, "but rather flows from a partial representation of God."[86] His journal also emphasized that this authoritarian state would inhabit a society in which economic decisions would be made by neither the free market nor the dictatorial state, but by organized professions who would inhabit the public sphere like other natural communities: the "freedom and independence" of the family, just like "the social milieu of the professions […] can only be guaranteed by a federal, corporative state."[87]

---

[84] Ibid. 1004.

[85] Messner, *Dollfuss* 103.

[86] Hildebrand, "Das Erbe von Dollfuss," *Christliche Ständestaat* 2, 30 (28 July 1935), 707-10, here 708.

[87] Münster, "Das Wesen des Föderalismus," op cit., here 785. For another example, see Otto Meinhardt, "Klasse und Stand," *Christliche Ständestaat* 2, 24 (16 June 1935), 593-6.

The Development of a Political Personalism

Although corporatist Catholicism differed in many ways from its civil-society counterpart, as we have just seen, its journals nonetheless developed a similar political vocabulary in the mid-1930s that would set them up for their surprising post-1945 career: personalism and anti-totalitarianism, the same two keywords we found in civil-society Catholicism, which was in other ways so different. We'll begin, again, with the person. In the previous chapter, we traced a notion of the person that was, in a sense, beyond politics: a political subject that was, paradoxically, defined by its abstraction, and protection, from the secular realm of politics. The corporatists defended a different, but recognizable, approach. "Such are the quarrels of 'personalism'," Fabrègues wrote in 1939. "Emmanuel Mounier and Louis Salleron, Denis de Rougemont and Thierry Maulnier, Gabriel Marcel and François Mauriac are equally attached to this notion of 'personal destiny.'"[88]

We saw in the previous chapter that the person had fallen out of favor in the late 1920s, even among Scheler's pupils and those, like Maritain, who had pioneered its use. The same was true among the Catholic right, although corporatists picked it up again a few years before their civil-society counterparts.[89] Fabrègues began to employ the notion in 1930, in the manifesto that opened *Réaction pour l'ordre*, one of the most important journals of the Jeune Droite. The manifesto, written by Fabrègues and signed by others who would join him in Vichy's cultural firmament, employs language that is familiar to us from Chapter 1: although Fabrègues had recently split from Maurras, the manifesto is very much a product of the Action française. "The human person" is for Fabrègues linked with the "immense question of order [, which is] the law of being. […] Social reaction: against

[88] Jean de Fabrègues, "Naissance des institutions de demain" *Combat* 4, 36 (June 1939), not paginated.

[89] It was not completely unknown in these circles : Pierre Maxence, for instance, used it in a positive review of Massis's *Défense de l'Occident* in 1927. He did not, however, make the person into a central part of this thought, or even of this review. Pierre Godmé [the real name of Pierre Maxence, under which name he would become more famous], "La vie intellectuelle: Défense de l'Occident," *La Revue Fédéraliste* 10 (1927), 461-5, here 465.

individualism, *étatisme* and class struggle, in favor of the free development of the human person in his natural social surroundings [cadres]."[90]

The person for Fabrègues was already in 1930, and would remain for the corporatist Catholics, an inescapably political notion: the person is not that which escapes or transcends all possible social settings, but rather that which can only be nourished in "natural social surroundings." Indeed, in Gonzague de Reynold's celebration of Salazar's *Estado Novo,* he emphasized that the state protects the "human person."[91] Although relations between the Jeune Droite and *Ordre Nouveau* were somewhat tense, Fabrègues and his colleagues nonetheless agreed with Denis de Rougemont's 1936 assertion that "true politics can only be the expression of the person himself [la personne même]."[92] In a 1932 letter to Maurras, Fabrègues clarifies: "Simply, for many of our contemporaries, profoundly perverted by an individualism that is both political and philosophical, the notion of man himself has been lost: that he is a person, that is to say, a political animal."[93] So for Fabrègues, the massified individual of a decadent society can only become a person through political means: specifically, through the reinsertion of the individual into his "natural social surroundings" (in the same letter, he said that his task was to transform the individual into the person). That same year, Roger Magniez, one of the most important of Fabrègues's collaborators, used the notion of the person to attack the creeping Americanization in French society, arguing that the American

[90] Manifeste, *Réaction pour l'ordre* 1, 1 (April 1930), 1-3, here 2.

[91] Reynold, *Portugal* 309.

[92] Denis Rougemont, *Politique de la Personne,* 2nd edition (Paris, 1946), here page 253 (from an article that originally appeared in *Ordre Nouveau* in 1936).

[93] Jean de Fabrègues to Charles Maurras, 10 March 1932, in *Cher Maître* (Paris, 1995), 130-4, here 130.

demolition of the family—one of the most important of Fabrègues's "natural social surroundings"—was denuding the person of his personality, leaving nothing behind but mass man.[94]

Fabrègues clarified his understanding of the person in March 1932. Our eternal self—the person—can only be attained by leaving behind our contingent individuality and seeking what is eternal, what is beyond: "In this way, definitively leaving the present moment, man also departs from himself." Fabrègues is adopting some of the proto-existentialist language that was decidedly not part of the Action Française's traditional personalism—indeed, he sounds more like Landsberg here than Cochin (he may have been familiar with Scheler, whom he cites in a later article). But he nonetheless turns this personalism towards the political, because it is only through participation in the social that man returns to himself, and like Kierkegaard's knight of faith, finds more than he left. "In this way, departing from ourselves, we receive the prize of our sacrifice: these very institutions return us to ourselves, completing us by surpassing us."[95] For Fabrègues, the decadent individual becomes a person through the mediation of institutions—personal commitment can never be enough, because that which transcends us is not eternal, but historical and social: in a word, political. We could look, also, at a January 1935 manifesto that Fabrègues released: characteristically, he begins with the fact that "man is a person." This declaration was being made simultaneously by civil-society Catholics, of course, but whereas they drew the conclusion that the sphere of politics had to be scrubbed free of the sacred, Fabrègues continued, instead, that a society of persons must admit of an order, and be "composed according to a hierarchy": "The two societies necessary to man," he wrote echoing Hildebrand, "are the family and the state."[96]

---

[94] Roger Magniez, "U.S.A. ou la mécanisation de l'homme." *Réaction pour l'ordre* 1, 34 (June-July 1930), 79-85, here 82.

[95] Jean de Fabrègues, "La Querelle de l'Humanisme," *Réaction pour l'ordre* 3, 10 (March 1932), 44-8, here 47.

[96] Anonymous, "Principes," *Revue du Xème siècle* 3 (January 1935), 11-14, here 11, 13, 14.

Before the rise of Perroux and Louis Salleron in the later 1930s, the favored economist of the Catholic right wing was Pierre Lucius, whose works were widely celebrated in the Action Française press of the 1930s (he would, like so many of these people, end up supporting Vichy). His arguments were continuous with those of Maurras: "The French parliamentary state no longer has more than a theoretical existence," Lucius claimed in 1934, echoing Maurras in his complaint about the role of oligarchies and the departure from nature.[97] Reliant, like Fabrègues, on the work of Cochin[98], Lucius employs the person/individual distinction as a critique of the liberal state: "Democracy," he claimed, "is ignorant of persons with their character and their own values, it only knows individuals, that is to say interchangeable unities."[99] Lucius was not alone on the French right: we could also think of Georges Coquelle-Viance, an important FNC publicist, who defended his corporatist society as the only one in which "societies of persons" could flourish. "The worker," he continued, "will no longer be delivered, like merchandise, to the law of supply and demand: he will be incorporated."[100]

François Perroux, in the long run more significant than Lucius, also adopted personalist vocabulary to describe his favored corporatist settlement, in the same 1938 volume discussed above. As with Fabrègues, Perroux's person was inescapably politicized and tended towards the existential; again like Fabrègues, Perroux adopted some of the existentialist personalism of Mounier and Landsberg, while also pointing out that his personalism was far more nation-centric and political than theirs.[101] Corporatist Austria is praised for its service to the person: Dollfuß's state, Perroux

---

[97] Pierre Lucius, *Révolutions du Xxème Siècle* (Paris, 1934), 16

[98] Pierre Lucius, *Faillite du Capitalisme?* (Paris, 1932), chapter 3.

[99] Pierre Lucius, *Révolutions du Xxème Siècle* 51.

[100] Georges Coquelle-Viance, "L'Ordre Corporatif," *Credo* 128 (November 1936), 15-21, here 16.

[101] François Perroux, *Capitalisme et communauté de travail* 286n.

gushes, "orders its ideas towards a general goal: an organization of social life that permits each human person [personne humaine] to realize his earthly and spiritual destiny in collaboration and communion with other human persons."[102] "Every person," Perroux writes, is "a continuous self-creation, a choice made according to an absolute."[103]

Both "liberal" and "totalitarian" states, Perroux holds, "misrecognize the human person, in both their internal logic and their activity." Both of them are rooted in individualism, and cannot properly embody the social nature of ethical life because they cannot encompass the person as a "totality". "In its essence," Perroux contends, "the State is anti-liberal."[104] While agreeing with the civil-society Catholics that the human person cannot be entirely subsumed within the state, he goes further and imagines a much more expansive political role in the constitution of the person. The basic point of his section on "The State and the Person" is not that these two inhabit radically different realms, but that they must be integrated on a higher plane. The state, for Perroux, "*is essentially an effort*. It is the effort of gathering a society in order to incarnate absolute moral values and make them penetrate the corporeal world."[105] The state, like the person, is in process of self-creation and, moreover, the state's goal is to incarnate those same values that are at work in the person. We have already seen how, for Perroux, social life should be organized around a declaration of the rights of the group, not the rights of man. This, he claims, will allow for the human person, as a "totality," to be folded into society, apart from which ethics are inconceivable.[106]

---

[102] Ibid. 126.

[103] Ibid. 258.

[104] Ibid. 255, 258.

[105] Ibid. 263. Emphasis in original

[106] Ibid. 267.

Whereas in France, personalism began its serious political mobilization around 1930, the notion had to wait until 1934 to make its rise in Austria, as refugees flooded into the tiny nation, bringing with them a vocabulary that might be used to prop up Dollfuß against the omnipresent threat of Anschluss. It was not a complete novelty in Mitteleuropa, although it never achieved the prominence in the 1920s that it had in France. The "person" was very occasionally used in a political sense in *Allgemeine Rundschau* in the early 1920s, presumably on account of Scheler's sojourn in Munich. In at least one instance, this led to amazing prescience: in 1923, Otto Sachse prefigured developments of the 1930s by deploying the "person" as a tool against both Bolshevism and Nazism, which was enjoying a great deal of support in Munich at the time. Neither of these systems, Sachse held, protected "the freedom of the person," and they both assimilated the person to the "mass." They were, moreover, united in their anti-Catholic materialism. Interestingly, though, Sachse does not then agitate for liberal democracy or the *Zentrum*: he was a correspondent for a monarchist journal, after all. "Europe is gradually collapsing into two great camps: West (Rome) and East (Moscow)," Sachse warned. "In them two great ideas struggle with one another: Person and mass, freedom and despotism, Fascism and Bolshevism."[107] Fascism is the valorized alternative, and in its Italian variety; Sachse had already written that Bolshevism and Nazism were essentially the same.

While Sachse's early version is interesting, the "person" fell into disrepute in favor of Catholic Romantic federalism, more inclined to treat the individual as part of the social organism than as an entity capable of transcending it. It came back, with Hildebrand, in 1934. This should not be abstracted from the civil-society context of the previous chapter: Hildebrand was in dialogue with Maritain, for instance, and he was present at the person-centered 1935 conference mentioned in the

[107] Otto Sachse, "Katholizismus und Faschismus," *Allgemeine Rundschau* 20, 2 (13 Jan 1923), 13-4. For another example of proto-personalism in *Allgemeine Rundschau*, see Wilhelm Walter, "Kirche und Persönlichkeit," *Allgemeine Rundschau* 19, 9 (4 March 1922), 100-1.

previous chapter.[108] Again, the "person" was part of the same anti-totalitarian (anti-Front, anti-Nazi, anti-Bolshevik) animus that was driving civil-society Catholicism, so this confluence is not surprising.

As among French corporatists, the Austrian version of the person was inextricably social and political: "when we approach the problematic of social being," wrote one contributor to Hildebrand's journal, "even here the person must be our central focus."[109] When Aurel Kolnai, a Hungarian student of Scheler's, sought to critique Othmar Spann and his philo-Nazism in 1934, it was his denial of "the fate of the Person" that was criticized.[110] Kolnai had, incidentally, attacked Spann already, in an article in *Abendland* in 1929 (which caused Kogon to leap to the defense of his teacher). In that article, it was not Spann's denial of the "individual" [der Einzelne]—not the person—that was at issue; even for Scheler's students, then, the "person" was not on the table as a political concept in the late 1920s.[111]

Like the Jeune Droite, Hildebrand began to put personalism at the service of Christian politics seriously around 1930, in his *Metaphysik der Gemeinschaft* published in that year. Doubtless Hildebrand—a Jew who had left Munich in 1922 out of fear of Hitler—was responding to the social collapse he could see all around him, and in this book he set out a personalist vision as to what might be done about it. He expanded on his ideas in a 1933 article for the prestigious journal, *Der*

---

[108] 26 October 1935, Gaston Fessard to Henri de Lubac, Box 73, folder 2, Fonds Fessard.

[109] Walter Münster, "Das Wesen des Föderalismus," *Christliche Ständestaat* 4, 33 (22 August 1937), 784-6, here 784

[110] A. van Helsing [pseudonym of Aurel Kolnai, per appendix to Ebneth, *Zwischen Kreuz und Hakenkreuz, op. cit.*], "Othmar Spanns Ganzheitlehre," *Christliche Ständestaat* 1, 49 (11 November 1934), 4-8, here 5, 7.

[111] Kolnai, "Spanns 'Universalismus' und katholisches Denken," *Abendland* 4, 7 (April 1929), 202-7. For Kogon's response, see Kogon, "Othmar Spanns Soziologie und der Katholizismus," *Abendland* 4, 9 (June 1929), 275-9. Eventually they patched up their differences and became friends, presumably when they both entered Hildebrand's circle; there is a photo of them at a café together in Barbara Hofer, "Joseph Eberle—Katholischer Publizist der Ersten Republik," *Alemannia Studens*, Bd. 3 (1993), 89-105, page 95.

katholische Gedanke, significantly entitled "The Corporative Idea and Natural Communities." He begins by laying out his phenomenological approach to personhood, adopting new Heideggerean language to make a familiar Schelerean point about the superiority of the person to his social surroundings. The person is an intentional being whose final goals outstrip himself, and finally point towards God. The hierarchy of value to which man aspires is not internal to him, or even to the world, but is transcendent and unchanging, and thus spared from history and the constantly shifting institutions that inhabit it. The person is "ontologically 'prior' to his membership, and even 'prior' to these communities themselves […] For the natural communities—including mankind, nation, state, and *Stand*—are not the *ontic* basis for the being of the individual, but rather individuals 'sustain [tragen]' these communities."[112]

Hildebrand quickly turns to the errors of individualism and its attendant social doctrines. Both liberalism and Communism are united in this denial of the person's transcendent value.[113] So only what Hildebrand calls "corporatism" can return the individual to his natural surroundings and develop his personality. More than Fabrègues, he was attuned to the absolute superiority of the person to any of the communities in which he finds himself. "The individual [Einzelmensch] is incomparably more than a mere member of a natural community. As individual, he is ontologically 'prior' to his membership [Gliedfunktion], and even prior to the particular community itself." Bolshevism and other forms of nationalism (by association, Nazism, which he was soon to flee) are alike in their denial of this fact, and in their desire to appropriate the person fully into his social or political surroundings. But Hildebrand is clear here that the society is nonetheless relevant to the flourishing of the person: societies, he says, are also oriented towards value. As a student of Scheler,

[112] Hildebrand, "Die korporative Idee und die natürlichen Gemeinschaten," *Der Katholische Gedanke* 6, 1 (1933), 48-58, here 54.

[113] Ibid. 51.

he of course held that only persons could phenomenologically access this *Wertbereich*, but a properly organized society—a society oriented by the natural needs of man—is a necessary precursor to the apprehension of value.[114]

This was not merely a personal interest of Hildebrand's: personalism was everywhere in mid-1930s Austria. Ernst Karl Winter used the "person" time and again in his left-leaning *Ständestaat* writings. The May 1934 constitution itself, which was the centerpiece of the whole movement, used the language of the Person, too: "The freedom of the person," begins Article 19, "is guaranteed." And, in *Christliche Ständestaat* itself, the "person" was not the province of Hildebrand alone. In a 1937 article called "The Essence of Federalism," for instance, Walter Münster explicitly links the Person explicitly with Romantic, federalist politics. "Knowledge of the Person," Münster declares, "is the coronation of knowledge of being in the true sense. […] Consideration of the nature of the person must constitute the starting point of sociology."[115] Quoting from *Quadragesimo anno*, he describes the "concentric, increasing communities" that nourish the person, notably the family. This Catholic concern leads us towards "federalism" as a protection of "subpolitical communities."[116]

Anti-Totalitarian Corporatism: 1934-1938

As in civil-society Catholicism, corporatist Catholicism adopted the new, and still almost exclusively Catholic, language of anti-totalitarianism to buttress their political-theological claims. This leads to the paradox of an anti-totalitarian fascism: these Catholics were no more willing than their counterparts to countenance the claims of the person-denying "total state." Although they were far more willing to make political prescriptions, and to theorize a close connection between

---

[114] Ibid. 54, 56-7, 55.

[115] Walter Münster, "Das Wesen des Föderalismus," *Christliche Ständestaat* 4, 33 (22 August 1937), 784-6, here 784.

[116] Ibid. 785.

religion and politics, this personalist politics was, as we have seen, employed in the name of a chastening of the state. Whereas we tend to think of fascism as a form of *étatisme*, these Catholics instead saw parliamentary and economic liberalism as the true face of *étatisme* run amok, and fascist corporatism as the only way to return the state to its natural frontiers. "The state deprived of its legitimate powers," argued one central Jeune Droite manifesto, "retains the ultimate power of oppressing its citizens."[117] The name for that domination, that expansion beyond the bounds of nature, was totalitarianism.

As in the circles discussed in Chapter 4, corporatist Catholics in both France and Austria began to adopt totalitarian language between 1934 and 1936. Again, this should be read in terms of politics: the category of the "total state" was available in 1932-3, but used only sporadically. Friedrich Muckermann, an Austrian Romantic from the Eberle circle, used the language in an open letter to Ernst Jünger in 1932 as a consequence of his notion of "total mobilization," without emphasizing the doctrine's novelty or seeing it as the name of that which threatens Christianity.[118] In France, meanwhile, it appears in Jeune Droite publications in an article about Gurian, and a selection from Mussolini's writings, in 1933, but its use does not expand from this local context.[119] The rudiments of the theory were available before 1934, of course: as we've seen above, it was already common to link together liberalism and Bolshevism as equally materialistic and person-denying.

---

[117] Robert Francis, Thierry-Maulnier, Jean-Pierre Maxence, *Demain la France* (Paris, 1934), 153. Francis and Maxence were outspoken Catholics; Maulnier one of Maurras's atheist followers.

[118] Friedrich Muckermann, "An Ernst Jünger," *Der Gral* 27 (November 1932), 81-6, here 84-5.

[119] Pierre Gan, "Communisme et humanité," *Revue du Siècle* 1, 7 (November 1933), 89-94, here 91; Benito Mussolini, "Idées fondamentales du Fascisme," *Revue du Siècle* 1, 3 (June 1933), 19-23, here 21.

Within the Jeune Droite, Henri Daniel-Rops, Thierry Maulnier, and Fabrègues himself were arguing this way already in the spring of 1933, and we've seen Hildebrand doing the same in 1933.[120]

But it was the political events of 1934 that allowed these disparate strands to come together and create full-blown totalitarianism theory: by 1937, Denis de Rougemont could plausibly write that "everyone knows, or at least senses, the meaning of the *totalitarian menace*: it is the 'coordination' ['mise au pas'] of our lives and of every aspect of our lives, whether spiritual or material, in the service of the deified State."[121] It was (and remains) a politically convenient tool: the Austrians could use it to link together the Bolshevik and National Socialist menace, while the French could use it to critique the Popular Front. It had, then, the same critical import for the corporatists as it did for the civil-society Catholics, even though exercised in the name of a diametrically-opposed political project. This led, incidentally, to some bizarre alliances: Hildebrand, for instance, celebrated Maritain's personalist work in the pages of his journal, whose foremost purpose was to defend a corporatist state that Maritain had, in a 1934 manifesto, judged illegitimate and violent.[122] Gurian, meanwhile, who had no sympathy for authoritarian corporatism, had his *Bolschewismus als Weltgefahr* celebrated in a long, front-page review of *L'Echo de Paris*, the FNC's newspaper, two separate issues of *Christliche Ständestaat*, *Vaterland* (a Viennese legitimist journal for which Hildebrand wrote), and *Wiener Politische Blätter* (edited by Ernst Karl Winter).[123]

---

[120] Henri Daniel-Rops, "Positions générales," *Revue française* 28 (April 1933), 489-97; Thierry Maulnier, "La révolution aristocratique," *Revue française* 28 (April 1933), 532-48; Jean de Fabrègues, introduction to "La jeunesse française devant l'Allemagne nouvelle," *Revue du siècle* 1, 2 (May 1933), 1-2.

[121] Denis de Rougemont, "Changer la vie ou changer l'homme," in *Communisme et les chrétiens* (Paris, 1937), 203-32, here 228. Emphasis in original.

[122] Dietrich von Hildebrand, review of Jacques Maritain, *Von der Christlichen Philosophie*, *Christliche Ständestaat* 2, 51 (22 December 1935), 1234-5. Maritain, "A propos de la répression des troubes de Vienne," *op. cit*.

[123] Robert d'Harcourt, "Bolchevisme et Hitlérisme," *L'Echo de Paris* 20,538 (10 January 1936), 1-2 ; W.R., review of *Bolschewismus als Weltgefahr*, *Christliche Ständestaat* 2, 39 (29 September 1935), 947-8; Laurenz Justi, "Bolschewismus und Nationalsozialismus," *Christliche Ständestaat* 2, 44 (3 November 1935), 1063-4; *Wiener Politische Blätter*, 13 October 1935, Nr. 5.; *Vaterland*, 213 (7 Sept. 1935), 2.

In France, corporatist Catholics came to the terminology *en masse* in 1934. Pierre Lucius, before the rise of Perroux the premier corporatist economist of this milieu, provides a very early totalitarian theory in his 1934 volume, *Révolutions du Xxème siècle*. As with others, Lucius sees totalitarianism as a product of bourgeois liberalism. "The nineteenth century was a century of anonymity and therefore of irresponsibility, destructive of the human personality," Lucius judges. "Moreover, democracy ignores persons with their character and their own values, it only knows individuals." [124] Once the person is abolished in the name of the individual, which requires the abolition of all the intermediary bodies that Lucius's corporatism sought to reinstate, the ground had been paved for totalitarianism, the menace common to Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and Bolshevik Russia. In these regimes, "the state is everything for everyone: it is 'totalitarian.'"[125]

The quotation marks around the term indicate that Lucius saw himself to be applying a familiar word in an unfamiliar way; they also appeared in an article for Fabrègues's *Revue du Siècle* that Lucius published in Spring 1934.[126] Over the next year, however, the quotation marks could disappear, as Catholics from across the corporatist spectrum adopted the terminology. It appears in *Demain la France* (1934), a manifesto of sorts collectively authored by three major Jeune Droite figures and dedicated to the fallen heroes of February 6th: although the French state is in drastic need of reform, they argue, "the French should not, at any price, let themselves be seduced […] by the barbarian myth of the totalitarian State."[127] In the inaugural November 1934 issue of Fabrègues's successor journal, called *Revue du Xxème siècle*, Pierre Loyer could refer without quotation marks to

---

[124] Pierre Lucius, *Révolutions du Xxème siècle* 51.

[125] Ibid. 85.

[126] Pierre Lucius, "La Charte du travail du troisième Reich," *Revue du Siècle* 2, 11-2 (March-April 1934), 47-60, here 48.

[127] Robert Francis et al., *Demain la France* 175. Although this does not necessarily refer to Bolshevism and Nazism together, it is clear from the rest of the book that they understood Marxism as part of the same rubric: Bolshevik socialism has, in their estimation, increasingly become "a capitalism of the state." 219.

"the example of the totalitarian regimes: Russia, Italy, Germany." (The article was, incidentally, devoted to criticizing the Popular Front)[128] In December, the royalist *Courrier Royale*, to which central Jeune Droite figures were contributing, warned against the "totalitarian étatisme" that was the necessary consequence of the denial of the corporation.[129] Two months later, in January 1935, "totalitarianism" had truly arrived in the Jeune Droite's central organ at the time. Jacques de Broze, in his "Essay on the Notion of the State," picks up on all of Lucius's themes, theorizing a personalist, corporatist state as the only antidote to the liberalism-totalitarianism nexus.[130] That issue contained three other articles discussing "totalitarianism" in a similar way.[131] In July 1935, Marcel Prelot, in a lecture at the July 1935 Semaines Sociales conference dedicated to the "corporative order," warned against "turning corporative organs into organs of the state: that is totalitarian étatisme."[132] A later account of the whole week of courses summarized it this way: "two adjectives, designating systems of government, were placed side by side: corporatist and totalitarian."[133] By 1937, when the corporatist Paul Chanson used it in his anti-Front volume, *Communisme ou corporatisme?*, the usage was well established.[134]

Through a closer look at Jean de Fabrègues and François Perroux, we'll see that their notion of totalitarianism mapped closely onto that of their civil-society ounterparts. Fabrègues began using

---

[128] P. Loyer, "Période de Transition," *Revue du Xxème siècle* 1 (November 1934), 44-8, here 44, 47.

[129] Anonymous, "Les Lois Sociales et la Corporation," *Courrier Royal* 1, 1 (10 December 1934), 16.

[130] Jacques de Broze, "Essai sur la notion d'Etat," *Revue du Xxème siècle* 2 (January 1935), 15-23, here 18-9.

[131] Jean Saillenfest, "Pour un régime des libertés," *Revue du Xxème siècle* 2 (January 1935), 24-31, here 24; Gerges Verdeil, "Entre l'individu et l'Etat: les corps sociaux," *Revue du Xxème siècle* 2 (January 1935), 32-8, here 37; Jean Loisy, "L'Homme et l'Etat," *Revue du Xxème siècle* 2 (January 1935), 39-43, here 39 and 41.

[132] Marcel Prelot, "Integration des organes corporatifs dans l'Etat," in *L'organisation corporative*, 82-7, here 82.

[133] Georges Jarlot, *Le Regime corporatif et les catholiques sociaux* (Paris, 1938), 210.

[134] Paul Chanson, *Communisme ou corporatisme?* (Paris, 1937), 14.

the theory himself in a March 1935 article in *Credo*, an organ of the FNC. "Whether they take place in Berlin or Moscow," Fabrègues writes, "the 'parades' or 'mass demonstrations' have a common end: to take the participants to such a degree of sentimental exaltation that they forget their personal reasons, where only the suggestion of the milieu remains." This reformulation of man takes the Nazi and Bolshevik state far beyond the confines set for them by nature. "All the 'totalitarian' revolutions of the twentieth century rapidly became spiritual, and not merely political."[135] Fabrègues was more explicit in a 1937 article, called simply "The State and Man," that he wrote for *Combat*, a journal he co-edited with Thierry Maulnier. "Every week that goes by," he lamented, "the power and prestige of the State increases across the globe." This is true both in the "totalitarian nations" and "those nations, France for example, that presume themselves to be 'democratic.'" To clarify, he turns to the twofold definition of the state proferred by the Société Française de Philosophie: first, organized moral society in the service of a collective destiny; second, an institution that delivers services to the population. In the totalitarian societies, the first version predominates and demolishes the person in the name of the "sacred and all-powerful State." The France of the Popular Front, in contrast, has developed the second definition of the State to the point of absurdity: French citizens see the state as a vast storehouse of goods, there for their material benefit. "The State of the Popular Front can only be regarded, today, as the means of satisfying the demands formulated last May [i.e. May 1936, the date of Blum's electoral triumph]." Both of these versions of the state are pathological: one makes of the state too much, and the other too little. What is required is the Catholic, corporatist solution: "today, what is required is a return to the state of its free power."[136]

---

[135] Jean de Fabrègues, "Forces Spirituelles de la France," *Credo* 110 (March 1935), 53-8, here 53.

[136] Jean de Fabrègues, "L'Etat et l'homme," *Combat* 2, 13 (March 1937), not paginated.

Fabrègues praises François Perroux for his adoption of totalitarianism theory: he "dares to say that the first revolutionary French state, that of the Jacobins, was essentially totalitarian."[137] Perroux had begun using totalitarianism theory in 1935, in the first edition of his book on National Socialism.[138] It was used only in passing, though, in that book; for the second edition of 1940, it was used more liberally. In the interim he had employed it in a 1937 article in *La Vie Intellectuelle* on the corporatist state to come, and more fully in his landmark 1938 volume on corporatism.[139] At that point, it entered the center of his political thought: in a 1938 article, he referred to "the totalitarian tendency inherent in each state."[140]

He was one of few French intellectuals to engage with the work of Carl Schmitt, with whom he was acquainted.[141] His understanding of the "total state" closely follows Schmitt's own, as explained in the opening section of this chapter; he was one of comparatively few French readers to acquire the language directly from the source. Like other corporatist Catholics, Perroux defined "totalitarianism" to mean the total imbrication of the economy and the state. But, adopting a distinction Schmitt had broached in his earlier articles for *Europäische Revue*, Perroux discussed "two meanings of the totalitarian state" with "general consequences affecting the relationships of the state and the economy." One of these is the liberal state, which, like others, Perroux felt ended in totalitarianism. "The liberal State," however, "is only totalitarian from the quantitative point of

---

[137] Jean de Fabrègues, "Corporatisme devant l'Etat," op. cit.

[138] François Perroux, *Les mythes hitlériens*, 94

[139] François Perroux, "La crise de l'Etat et l'Etat de démain," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 50, 3 (25 June 1937), 367-81, here 376

[140] François Perroux, "Weltanschauung et politique," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 59, 1 (10 October 1938), 10-32, here 20.

[141] It is not clear how or when they met one another, but Perroux announces in the first edition of his work on Nazism (1935) that he was already acquainted with Schmitt, whom he regarded as Nazism's ablest defender. Only one letter to Schmitt survives in Düsseldorf; in it, Perroux reminisces about their conversations in Berlin. Perroux to Schmitt, 9 September 1943, RSW265 10878, Nachlaß Schmitt.

view." The "new State" of Nazi Germany, on the other hand, is qualitatively totalitarian—totalitarian "in intensity and in energy."[142]

While Perroux praises this dynamism, like Fabrègues he felt that the National Socialist devotion to the State was tremendously overblown, and they both drew on longer traditions of Prussia as the home of the *Dieu-État* that were traced in Part I. Where Fabrègues referred to the "sacred" role of the state in Germany, Perroux claims that it has "divinized" the Aryan race.[143] It was not even the policies of the state that incensed Perroux, but its étatiste *form*: "I do not reproach National Socialism for promoting an unjust and violent state," Perroux wrote in 1937, "but rather for preaching and spreading a false religion of which the State is both Church and God."[144] This étatisme, Perroux claimed, renders true corporatism impossible. "We speak of corporatist achievements [in Germany]," Perroux wrote in 1935. "But in fact, employers are not integrated into the Work Front [Front du Travail]. Corporatist ideology and terminology are spread only as a substitute for, and antidote to, Marxist vocabulary. It is no longer a question of employers and employees, but of the *Führer* and *Gefolgschaft* [loyalty]."[145] Like Fabrègues, then, Perroux thought that while Nazi totalitarianism might be superior to flaccid democratic *étatisme*, it was still rooted in the heretical denial of natural communities that could only flourish in a corporatist order. Corporatism was, for Perroux, the only antidote to totalitarianism: the Nazi state, he wrote, "is not corporatist or *ständisch* but totalitarian in the most oppressive sense of the term."[146]

---

[142] François Perroux, *Des mythes hitlériens à l'Europe allemande* (Paris, 1940), 109-10.

[143] François Perroux, *Les mythes hitlériens* 79.

[144] François Perroux, "Grandeur et misère de l'Etat national-socialiste," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 47, 2 (25 January 1937), 223-32, here 224

[145] François Perroux, *Les mythes hitlériens* 43.

[146] François Perroux, *Capitalisme et communauté de travail* 101.

A similar version of totalitarianism theory could be found amongst Austrian corporatists, even amongst its leaders: Schuschnnigg himself declared that "the Catholic spirit of our nation […] would clash with a totalitarian state ideology."[147] "G.P.U. and Gestapo," wrote one of its contributors, providing perhaps the first lexical totalitarianism theory, "begin with the same letters."[148] "Totality," wrote one of the journal's contributors in 1935, "is a concept that, today, everybody needs."[149] Hildebrand went out of his way to ensure that these needs were met: his journal was constantly filled with anti-totalitarian invective against the theories of Schmitt and Spann. Recall that the journal's mission was to support Austro-fascism against Nazism, and their sympathy for Italy's project: the remarkable feature of the journal's rhetorical stance, like that of the Jeune Droite, is that these corporatist fascists chose "totalitarian" as the name of all that they opposed—all that put God's order at risk. Joint opposition to Nazism and Bolshevism was the mission of the journal from the beginning: "*Christliche Ständestaat*," the journal announced in one of its earliest numbers, "designates Austria as the state destined to serve as the Christian bulwark against Bolshevism and National Socialism."[150] They came to the term in the winter of 1934-5—that is, at about the same time as the French corporatists and the civil-society Catholics discussed in the previous chapter. Aurel Kolnai, a Hungarian student of Scheler who we have met before, discussed Spann's "Totalitarismus" in November 1934, for instance. In early 1935, at least two articles appeared that were explicitly on the theme of "totality," while another spate of anti-totalitarian articles appeared in the fall of 1935. By that point, the language had become ubiquitous in the

---

147 Gellott, "Defending Catholic Interests in the Christian State: The Role of Catholic Action in Austria, 1933-1938,"

148 Otto Maria Karpfen, writing in 1936. Quoted on Martin Kugler, *Die frühe Diagnose des Nationalsozialismus* (Frankfurt, 1995), 146.

149 Sepp Aigner, "Totalität," *Christliche Ständestaat* 2, 11 (17 March 1935), 259-61, here 259.

150 Quoted on Ebneth, *Die österreichische Wochenschrift* Der Christliche Ständestaat 67.

journal: even dyed-in-the-wool traditionalists, like the aged nobleman Hans Karl Zessner-Spitzenberg (who had written for Eberle's *Neue Reich*) were wielding the term, and Hildebrand himself used it constantly in his articles. In 1937, when the Viennese art historian Leopold Zahn sought to characterize the difference between the two Germanies—i.e., between noble, Austrian tradition and barbaric Nazism—he organized his thoughts around the theme, "The Totalitarian and the Universal German."[151]

"I assume," Hans Barion wrote to Schmitt in 1934, "that Mr. Niermann has sent you the interesting article from *Christliche Ständestaat*, probably written by Dietrich von Hildebrand, in which our suspension [referring to Barion and Eschweiler's suspension from priestly duties] is explained as a strike—against you."[152] This was not out of the ordinary: Hildebrand and his colleagues lost no opportunity to lambast Schmitt, whom they, like Gurian and Perroux, considered the most able and therefore most dangerous intellectual defender of the National Socialist regime. Their other major opponent was Othmar Spann: together, Spann and Schmitt were the theorists of *Totalität* against whom the corporatists judged their own personalist, anti-totalitarian Catholicism.[153]

---

[151] An incomplete list of articles in *Christliche Ständestaat* containing totalitarianism theory/vocabulary, some of which are mentioned in this paragraph: A. van Helsing (i.e. Aurel Kolnai), "Othmar Spanns 'organische' Staatslehre," *Christliche Ständestaat* 1, 50 (18 November 1934), 7-10; Sepp Aigner, "Totalität," *Christliche Ständestaat* 2, 11 (17 March 1935), 259-61; Richard Behrendt, "Die Totalität des Politischen," *Christliche Ständestaat* 2, 17 (28 April 1935), 395-7; Nikolaus Heinrich [Nikolaus Dohrn], "Politischer Katholizismus und Illegalität, op. cit.; H. Leszinski, "Die 'Freund-Feind-Setzung,'" *Christliche Ständestaat* 2, 39 (29 September 1935), 934-6; Hildebrand, "Staat und Ehe," op. cit.; Zessner-Spitzenberg, "Oesterreich, Habsburg und Föderalismus," *Christliche Ständestaat* 3, 1 (5 Jan 1936), 5-7; Hildebrand, "Optimistischer und pessimistischer Illusionismus," *Christliche Ständestaat* 3, 23 (7 June 1936), 535-7; Hildebrand, "Warum Kampf gegen den Bolschewismus?", *Christliche Ständestaat* 3, 45 (8 November 1936), 1066-8; Leopold Zahn, "Der totalitäre und der universale Deutsche," *Christliche Ständestaat* 4, 45 (14 November 1937), 1067-8; Dohrn, review of R.N. Coudenhove Kalergi, *Totaler Staat—Totaler Mensch, Christliche Ständestaat* 4, 5 (26 December 1937), 1221-3; Wilhelm Röpke, "Andre Gide's Anklage gegen Russland und den Totalen Staat," *Christliche Ständestaat* 4, 5 (7 February 1937).

[152] Hans Barion to Carl Schmitt, 20 November 1934, RSW 265 687, Nachlaß Schmitt.

[153] For anti-Spann articles, see A. van Helsing [i.e. Aurel Kolnai], "Othmar Spanns Ganzheitlehre," *Christliche Ständestaat* 1, 49 (11 November 1934), 4-8; A. van Helsing [Kolnai], "Othmar Spanns 'organische' Staatslehre," op. cit.; Hildebrand, "Staat und Ehe," *Christliche Ständestaat* 2, 42 (20 October 1935), 1002-4; Hildebrand, "Individuum und Gemeinschaft," *Christliche Ständestaat* 1, 50 (18 November 1934), 3-7; Anonymous, "Othmar Spann und Ägypten," *Christliche Ständestaat* 2, 48 (1 December 1935), 1162; Anonymous, "Klarheit gegen Othmar Spann," *Christliche Ständestaat* 3, 1 (5 January 1936), 24-5; Anonymous, "Othmar Spanns Lehre," *Christliche Ständestaat* 3, 25 (21 June 1936), 598; Junius Austriacus, "Henlein

Aurel Kolnai—the Hungarian student of Husserl and Scheler—launched in 1934 a two-part attack on Spann, rehearsing arguments he had made in an earlier article in *Abendland*. One novelty, though, was Kolnai's adoption of the language of *Totalitarismus*, which was still extremely rare in its noun form; he also emphasizes now that Spann's theories bring him close to Bolshevism, which he considered to be, as Hildebrand had put it a few months earlier, "the brother of Nazism."[154] Spann was a lightning rod for Austrian critics of Nazism, as his theories of *Totalität* seemed to polemicists then, as to some scholars now, to prefigure the totalitarian denial of rights: Karl Polanyi, in an English-language discussion of Spann in 1935, in fact translated "Ganzheitslehre" as "Totalitarianism."[155] "Spann," Kolnai wrote, "is the philosopher of the total state in the most challenging and thoroughly metaphysical sense."[156] Kolnai's critique of Spann is familiar, and essentially unchanged from a similar article he wrote for *Abendland* in 1929: Spann denies the "the fate of the person" by destroying the legitimate sovereignty of the intermediary bodies between man and *der wahre Staat*, etc. Like Fabrègues and others, though, Kolnai also emphasizes that the totalizing of the state leads paradoxically to its demolition: "Totalitarianism, in Spann's work, is that which destroys and atomizes the state."[157]

---

und Spann—Ideologische Huntergründe," *Christliche Ständestaat* 3, 27 (5 July 1936), 639-41. For anti-Schmitt articles, see Richard Behrendt, "Die Totalität des Politischen," *op. cit.*; H. Leszinski, "Die 'Freund-Feind-Setzung,'" *Christliche Ständestaat* 2, 39 (29 September 1935), 934-6; Anonymous, "Carl Schmitt—Tief Gesunken," *Christliche Ständestaat* 3, 42 (18 October 1936), 1010; F.B. [probably Franz Blei], "Der Fall Carl Schmitt", *Christliche Ständestaat* 3, 51/ 2 (25 December 1936), 1217-20. There is at least one other—the one mentioned by Barion—that I have been unable to locate.

[154] Dietrich von Hildebrand, "Der 'Sklavenaufstand' gegen den Geist," (21 January 1934), in Hildebrand, *Memoiren und Aufsätze gegen den Nationalsozialismus*, *op. cit.*, 198-205, here 199.

[155] Karl Polanyi, "The Essence of Fascism," in *Christianity and the Social Revolution* (London, 1935), ed. John Lewis et. al., 359-93, here 364.

[156] Helsing [Kolnai], "Othmar Spanns Ganzheitlehre," op. cit., 4.

[157] Helsing [Kolnai], "Othmar Spanns 'organische' Staatslehre," op. cit., 9.

In Schmitt's case, too, it was his theory of the total state in particular that incensed the journal's writers. The first major article on Schmitt, written by the sociologist Richard Behrendt, was called simply "The Totality of the Political."[158] The journal's most extended attack of Schmitt appeared in a remarkable article, probably written by Franz Blei and infused, as were Gurian's anti-Schmitt pieces, with emotion and disappointment: "How," Blei wondered, "could this Roman Rhenish Catholic [note the adjectival order!], who wrote the classic *Roman Catholicism and Political Form*, succumb to the Leviathan-state?"[159] Blei gives a somewhat personal account of Schmitt's increasing misanthropy and Protestant tendencies, which led him to hitch his wagon to whatever star—first Schleicher, then von Papen—that seemed to share his contempt for the masses. But then he found Hitler: "In this way, Schmitt sought and found the man who had the masses, but lacked a theory of the state." This theory was, of course, that of the total state: "As a publicist, Schmitt has since 1933 restricted himself to doing everything possible to defend his indefensible theory of the total state."[160]

Hildebrand, as the journal's leading intellectual, provides what we might think of as the official version of the journal's totalitarianism theory. Like others, he was equally opposed to Spann and Schmitt as knights of the total: in a sense, his political theory had been predetermined from the beginning by his opposition to Schmitt, whose work had occasioned Hildebrand's first forays into the world of political theory. His critique should not, at this point, be surprising: like Kolnai, he saw the two heresies yoked together by "anti-personalism," which turned the "community" into a

---

158 Behrendt had written about Schmitt before, in *Politischer Aktivismus* (Leipzig, 1932), esp 129-31, and was clearly familiar with his entire oeuvre.

159 F.B., "Der Fall Carl Schmitt", op. cit., here 1218. It cannot be definitively proven that Blei wrote this article, but it is extremely likely: it is clear from the article that the author had known Schmitt well since 1917, which was the year Schmitt started publishing in *Summa*, the journal that Blei edited. I can think of nobody else with the initials F.B. that Schmitt would have known from such an early date—when he was, after all, still a young, morose non-entity.

160 Ibid. 1219-20.

"mass." Moreover, like every other Catholic totalitarian theorist, he saw the totalitarian threat as endemic to the logic of secular liberalism:

> Modern anti-personalism, as it confronts us in Bolshevism and National Socialism, is, as we have already demonstrated time and again, not an overcoming of liberal individualism, but rather its last and most radical consequence.[161]

"This purely instrumental conception of the human person," Hildebrand explained in July 1934, "conforms with the idea of the totalitarian State, that is to say a state […] which must speak the last word over all other communities, such as family, marriage and church."[162] In these terms, in both France and Austria, the paradox of an anti-totalitarian fascism was forged. In Part III we will see how this translated, surprisingly well, into the anti-totalitarian, Cold War federalism that would be the pre-eminent political position of conservative Catholics in both France and Germany.

[161] Dietrich von Hildebrand, "Masse und Gemeinschaft," *Christliche Ständestaat* 3, 2 (12 January 1936), 31-3, here 33.

[162] Dietrich von Hildebrand, "Die letzte Maske fällt" (July 1934), in *Memoiren und Aufsätze gegen den Nationalsozialismus*, op. cit., 236-40, here 237-8.

Part III: The Church Triumphant, 1938-1950

If neither individualism nor totalitarianism, then what?
--Abbé Bruno de Solages, 1937[1]

[1] Bruno de Solages, "Personnes et Société: leurs rapports," *La personne humaine en peril*, 229-50, here 242 (reprint of an address delivered in 1937).

Chapter 6: Catholicism, Neoliberalism, and the Prehistory of the Cold War, 1938-44

We must begin with the ruthless insight that whoever does not want collectivism must want the market economy.
--Wilhelm Röpke, 1944[2]

One sleepless night in 1946, a Catholic economist named Daniel Villey was visited by the restless spirit of John Stuart Mill (or, at least, so he reported in his book, *Redevenir les hommes libres*, published that year). Luckily for Villey, Mill's spirit was a benevolent one, generous with his wisdom and insight into France's postwar difficulties. There were some significant differences between this spectral Mill and the historical one: Villey's Mill had not corresponded with Comte, had not married Harriet Taylor, and had not become a socialist in his later days. Instead, "without renouncing anything from his first vision of the world, he had met Christ and adopted the Catholic faith."[3] In a long disquisition, Mill explains this change of heart by arguing that Catholicism alone is capable of defending liberalism, properly understood. The true Catholic, like the true liberal, recognizes the utter insufficiency of all human truths. They each see that purely human plans are doomed from the start; they each see that all towers follow the blueprint of Babel. This had immediate political consequences, Mill explains: "'Beware,' [Mill] told me, 'the invasion of collective ends! […] Everyone in his own fashion, and in his own language, affirms the preeminence of collective ends, and is prepared to immolate the individual on their altar. On this point as with others," Mill concludes, "not only the Soviet propaganda machine, but that of almost all democratic parties is in step with Adolf Hitler."[4]

---

[2] Quoted on Paul Nolte, *Die Ordnung der deutschen Gesellschaft* (München, 2000), 291.

[3] Daniel Villey, *Redevenir les hommes libres* (Paris, 1946), xxiii-xxiv.

[4] Ibid. lxvii.

This signals a new stage for Catholic social thought: their dreams were no longer haunted only be the specters of evil competitors, but by the friendly spirits of liberals. In the face of catastrophe, Catholics were learning to look outside their own tradition for allies against the totalitarain onslaught. In the years after 1945, Christian Democratic parties, devoted to liberal forms of economic governance, would rise to power across the continent, while the Cold War West in general dedicated itself to a peculiarly Christian form of social-scientific discourse.

Many non-Catholics huddled under the capacious umbrella of "Cold War Liberalism" were engaged in similar projects. This same sense of secularism's exhaustions can be found in the work of influential theologians like Reinhold Niebuhr, but also in less religiously-motivated writers like Isaiah Berlin, Carl Friedrich, George Kennan, Karl Löwith, Jacob Talmon, and Eric Voegelin. They arrived at what we might call the "liberalism of anxiety" or the "liberalism of despair": a realist liberalism alive to the imperfectabilities of human nature and the totalitarian dangers lurking at the heart of the modern project as announced in 1789.[5] Cold War liberals, as Jan Werner-Müller has pointed out, tended to subscribe to some form of value pluralism, meaning that they did not believe that any single way of life—including a secular one—could be prescribed as best for everyone. The attempts to instantiate secular utopia had ended in violence; the best that the political order could do was "piecemeal social engineering," avoiding the hopeless crusades for equality or justice writ large that had, they believed, marred preceding decades.

[5] For an unfriendly account, see Ze'ev Sternhell, *The Anti-Enlightenment Tradition,* trans. David Maisel (New Haven, 2010), especially Chapter 8. On Cold War liberalism more broadly, see Jan Werner-Müller, "Fear and Freedom: On 'Cold War Liberalism'", *European Journal of Political Theory* 7 (2008), 45-64. Although many imagined themselves to be novel, they might best be seen as a reactivation of the pessimism, and fear of the masses, that had animated nineteenth-century figures like Tocqueville and Mill himself. For an interesting version of this case, see Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, trans. Thomas Burger (Cambridge, MA, 1991), 129-40.

Many politicians, both American and European, were equally convinced that the totalitarian nightmare of the war had been a result of secular hubris run amok.[6] Konrad Adenauer, Robert Schuman, and other Christian Democrats used apocalyptic language to describe the nature of the burgeoning Cold War.[7] In America, too, Cold War rhetoric quickly took on a Christian tone, while Britain was experiencing the first inklings of evangelical revival.[8] "Both religion and democracy," Truman proclaimed, "are founded on one basic principle, the worth and dignity of the individual man and woman."[9] American liberals imagined themselves partaking in a "War of Civilizations," figuring the Soviet Union as the atheistic enemy of civilization. In January 1939, Roosevelt announced his aim to seek "an international order in which the spirit of Christ shall rule the hearts of men and of nations."[10] Harry Truman was a major figure in this discourse, speaking in 1946 of the "fundamental unity of Christianity and democracy"; similar statements were made in Britain, too, and became numbingly familiar as the Cold War wore on.[11]

All of this is, or should be, very surprising. This chapter will begin to tell the story of the Catholic-liberal rapprochement, focusing on the period 1938-1944. We already know that Catholics and liberals collaborated in the Cold War, but, in the absence of this prehistory, it becomes easy to

---

[6] For a wide-ranging account of this sensibility in postwar German life, see Dagmar Herzog, *Sex after Fascism* (2007), Chapters 1-3.

[7] For Adenauer, see the speeches collected in Konrad Adenauer, *World Indivisible*, trans. Richard and Clara Winston (New York, 1955); for Schuman, see the evidence collected in Alan Paul Fimister, *Robert Schuman* (Brussels, 1998).

[8] Callum Brown, *Religion and Society in Twentieth-Century Britain* (Harlow, 2006), Chapter 5; Jonathan Herzog, *The Spiritual-Industrial Complex* (New York, 2011); William Inboden, *Religion and American Foreign Policy, 1945-60* (New York, 2008); Jason W. Stevens, *God-Fearing and Free* (Cambridge, MA, 2011)

[9] Inboden, *Religion and American Foreign Policy, 1945-1960*, 109.

[10] Jacques Maritain happily quotes this in *Christianity and Democracy*, trans. Doris Ansen (New York, 1944), 58.

[11] Keith Robbins, "Britain, 1940, and 'Christian Civilization'," in *History, Religion and Identity in Modern Britain* by Keith Robbins (London, 1993), 195-214; Diane Kirby, "Divinely Sanctioned: The Anglo-American Cold War Alliance and the Defence of Western Civilization and Christianity, 1945-48," *Journal of Contemporary History* 35 (2000), 385-412.

chalk this up to historical expedience, as though the Americans were simply able to purchase whatever sort of political ideology they chose. The Catholic-liberal alliance, however, went deeper than that. Once we move the timeframe back a bit, we reach the unsurprising conclusion that the Catholic-liberal alliance was not carried out in the name of "democracy" as a state form. In the specific context of late 1940s Europe, Catholics and neoliberals were convinced democrats, but this was for contingent reasons: they harbored deep suspicion of parliamentary governments. Once we see this, the trajectory of Cold War liberalism and European reconstruction appears in a new light. Specifically, we can see that Cold War liberalism, whose origins can largely be found from within the Vichy regime itself, was tied to authoritarian politics from the beginning. It is often believed that Cold War liberalism began as a stridently anti-Communist and noble dream, before turning towards military solutions and dictatorial politics in response to the global crises of the 1950s and 1960s, notably the quagmire of Vietnam.[12] There is more, though, to the story: Cold War liberalism is tied to interwar crisis, and suspicion of democracy, from its origins.

These works, however, are unsatisfying in some ways: they show that the voting masses were swayed by religious rhetoric and symbols, and they show that politicians perceived, or pretended to perceive, the Cold War as a spiritual battle. But in what ways does this, fundamentally, matter? Religion, these works show, is empirically present, but to what end? Modern states, especially those constructed after 1945, exercise power by means of economic organization and planning. State bureaucracies matter much more, in the end, than do intellectuals and the symbols they wield.

This question has never been satisfactorily answered, which allows accounts from political scientists and economic historians to completely overlook the religious dimension. Consider, for instance, Neil Brenner's *New State Spaces* and Barry Eichengreen's *European Economy after 1945*. I take

[12] See Nils Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future* (Baltimore, 2003) on this.

these to be two exemplary accounts of post-1945 European reconstruction. They come from quite different perspectives: Brenner from neo-Marxist critical geography, Eichengreen from economic history. Neither of them are at all interested in the role religion plays here: the fact that they are talking about times and places that were governed by Christian Democratic parties, and all of the Christian symbolism uncovered by the last generation of historians, is allowed to go completely unmentioned—and the reader feels that nothing significant is missing. So, again, in what way does religion *actually* matter?[13]

In Part III of the dissertation, I will hazard an answer. Catholicism mattered in two distinct, but related ways. First, as a *discourse of legitimation*. Nearly every consideration of post-1945 European politics has marveled at the consensus and stability of those years: there were no longer massive groups of voters and soldiers clamoring to tear down the parliamentary order. In the 1930s, at least three major transnational movements were scrapping over the wreckage of the old order: Communists, Fascists, Catholics. Only Catholicism survived unscathed in Western and Central Europe. It mattered enormously that Catholics believed in the legitimacy of the new regimes: it was not written in stone that any of these movements would survive and support an Americanized, consumerist, democratic Europe. The fact that Catholics *did* was absolutely necessary to the maintenance of the new order. Second, as a *strategy of governance*—in other words, as a social science. In many ways, which will be explored in upcoming chapters, regimes adopted recognizably Catholic principles. The vogue for European federalism, the relatively small scale of economic nationalization, the protection of the nuclear family as the unit of welfare, and more: these principles survived, *mutatis mutandis*, from the Catholic tradition as it had existed for decades. This is all very abstract, of course, and in the rest of the dissertation I will add some flesh to these brittle bones.

---

[13] Neil Brenner, *New State Spaces* (New York, 2004); Barry Eichengreen, *The European Economy Since 1945* (Princeton, 2007).

To understand these phenomena, we will have to look far beyond the world of Catholicism itself. Catholicism's triumph did not come, like Stalin's, on the battlefield. It was a war of hearts and minds, yes, but it was also a war of diplomacy. Catholics selectively presented their own history in order to win the goodwill of Americans, and they were willing to collaborate with other social theorists (particularly economists) whom they did not deem a threat. In this chapter, we will see how they began to forge ties with other social theorists against a common enemy. The magnitude of this phenomenon should not be overlooked: the neoliberals were themselves either secular or Protestant, and there was scarce precedent for this form of collaboration.

In this chapter, also, we will also see how the corporatist and civil-society positions began to approach one another. To reiterate, these were relatively distinct positions in the 1930s, and these differences had largely disappeared by the 1940s. Of course, a major factor here was the disappearance of (most) authoritarian Catholic regimes. In a Europe split between occupying armies, Salazar-style corporatism seemed hopelessly out of touch. This was not, though, solely a result of power politics and geopolitical realities. Again, ideas mattered. The unifying rhetoric of "personalism" and "anti-totalitarianism" paved the way towards collaboration. We can see the sides moving together in the late 1930s, insofar as both groups were enthralled by the possibilities of neoliberal economics. The neoliberals provided, in other words, a path between civil-society and corporatist Catholicism. For the civil-society Catholics, it provided a language for them to return to politics: a truly political language that was anti-totalitarian without tending towards the heretical political theologies of the corporatists. For the corporatists, it provided a ready-made social-scientific discourse that bore many similarities to their own theories and had the added benefit that it would survive the collapse of their regimes. If politics had split Catholicism into two parts, social science could bring them back together.

This chapter will be broken into three parts. The first will analyze neoliberalism in its own right, focusing on their *main tendue* to the Catholics. The second will turn to the corporatists: post-*Anschluss*, they were centered in France, so we will be looking at Vichy France and the growing ties between *Jeune Droite*, corporatist Catholicism and neoliberalism. The third section will turn to the civil-society Catholics: they were nourished by the addition of a clutch of Austrians, newly-convinced, for obvious reasons, that Catholic corporatism was not the panacea they had dreamed for.

Neoliberalism and Christianity: Raymond Aron and Wilhelm Röpke

Liberalism would not seem like a likely partner. Even though most were rejected, plenty of feelers were sent out between Catholics and socialists, Catholics and Communists, and Catholics and Fascists in the 1920s and 1930s. But Catholics and Liberals? There was some nineteenth-century precedent, but for half a century liberalism had defined itself as the other of Catholicism.[14] Regardless, liberalism did not seem like a growth industry in the 1930s: its failure seemed obvious, and the great liberal parties of the past either lay in ruins or in alliance with a Blum régime that was clearly not liberal in any recognizable sense. The failure seemed obvious to liberals, too, so "neoliberals" arrived to salvage their tradition, updating it for a new age of "postcapitalist" economic management. Neoliberals accepted the critique of the laissez-faire state: they were creatures of their time. They theorized a liberalism that would protect the market without falling prey to the monopoly-capitalism and obvious market-failures of past *laissez-faire* models—a liberalism in which the state would play a role, but a small one. In the world of the 1930s and 1940s, Catholics were their only allies: no other social theory, or electoral force, believed in private property and the limited

[14] Michael Gross, *The War Against Catholicism* (Ann Arbor, 2004); Helena Rosenblatt, *Liberal Values: Benjamin Constant and the Politics of Religion* (Cambridge, 2008).

state. As we will see in this section, neoliberals aggressively courted Catholic opinion, and the embrace was returned.

The founding moment of neoliberalism was the *Colloque Walter Lippmann*, a conference convened by Louis Rougier in Paris in 1938 to discuss the work of the American journalist. It brought together Raymond Aron, Wilhelm Röpke, and others who were in the process of retheorizing liberalism, both political and economic, for illiberal times. Although there were some links between the neoliberalism of 1938-44 and that of today—Villey was Milton Friedman's immediate predecessor as president of the Mont Pèlerin Society, for instance—the differences outweigh the similarities.

Neoliberals differed from classical liberals in two major ways. First, the state: neoliberals were harshly critical of the much-ballyhooed "night watchman" state. To stick with that metaphor, they wanted to bring the state out of the night and into the full light of day, directing traffic and making its sovereign presence felt throughout society. Like Catholics, they felt that the economistic approach of their forebears, and their belief that a free market would naturally and necessarily lead to just outcomes, was naïve. Louis Rougier—who as organizer of the *Colloque Walter Lippmann* in 1938 served as a sort of ringleader—declared that

> the liberal regime is not solely the result of a spontaneous natural order as several authors of the eighteenth century with their Codes of Nature declared. It is also the result of a juridical order that presupposes the legal intervention of the state. Economic life occurs within a legal order, one that fixes the regime of property[.][15]

In both France and Germany, neoliberals were especially incensed by the formation of trusts and monopolies, which the free market and the Manchester state had been helpless to prevent; only once the state had come out of the shadows, and dedicate itself to rigorously and fairly setting up the preconditions for a healthy market, could a liberal society free from monopolization become a

[15] Quoted Samuel Gregg, *Wilhelm Röpke's Political Economy* (Cheltenham, 2010), 82.

possibility. "If […] we organize the economy of the social body according to the rules of the market economy," declared Rüstow at the 1938 *Colloque*, "there remain new and heightened need for integration to be satisfied."[16]

In addition, and even more importantly, neoliberals were convinced that the free society could not be "value-free": although the free market, protected by a strong state, remained the linchpin of their social vision, they did not think this to be possible without a strong sense of shared values and commitments. This is often forgotten about neoliberals, insofar as we tend to indiscriminately lump them with unrepentant neoclassical economists. Friedrich von Hayek, to take an extreme example, described the necessity of shared values in his *Road to Serfdom*, and he was far from alone. Alfred Müller-Armack, one of the most important German neoliberals, was intensely interested in social Catholicism, and had received his doctorate at the University of Cologne (which was teeming, as we saw in Chapter 3, with social Catholics). Walter Eucken, perhaps the progenitor of German neoliberalism, had already declared in 1932 that modern life could "only be given a comprehensive meaning again by religion, by the belief in God."[17] When the German neoliberals created their house organ in 1950, they called it *Ordo*: an explicit reference to the Thomist precursors they saw to their own project.

Louis Rougier's long career is indicative of this transformation. His major work of the 1920s —*La scolastique et le thomisme* (1925)—was an intervention into the neo-Thomist revival, discussed in Chapter 1, from the idealist perspective of Brunschvicg and Alain. It was flagrantly anti-religious, condemning Thomism as the half-baked answer to a wrongly-put question. Rougier condemns, typically, Aristotle's realist enterprise along with Thomas's attempts to salvage it. Whereas Maritain

[16] Quoted Michel Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics,* trans. Graham Burchell (New York, 2008), 262 (characteristically, Foucault misquotes; this correct version comes from the footnote).

[17] Quoted Ibid. 31. Walter Eucken's father, incidently, was Rudolf Eucken, a mentor of Max Scheler's.

had celebrated the cool, scientific rationality of Aquinas's work, Rougier dismissed it as "[d]runk on the divine," substituting "mystical delirium" for "passive observation." English deism, Rougier held, constituted one step on the long road from medieval ignorance to secular rationality.[18] By 1938, Rougier had begun to alter his reading of Christianity: deism, with its "belief in a natural and essential order of human societies," was decried as the "theological origin of the liberal mystique" (referring here to the non-constructive, laissez faire liberalism of the past).[19] He was still skeptical of Catholic corporatism, but now he argued from a different perspective. He no longer discussed the enslavement of the mind, but rather the free operation of the price mechanism; in this regard, the corporatism of the social encyclicals was no better than, but also no worse than, the laissez-faire liberalism it set out to replace. They both, Rougier held, led directly to totalitarianism.[20] By 1949, in the work's second edition, his reading of Catholicism and, particularly, Thomism had improved yet again: he added a new appendix, dedicated to the proposition that the liberal economy, properly understood, "is in perfect agreement with what the Church calls, conforming to Thomist terminology, *the economy of the common good*." In this appendix, Rougier performs a detailed reading of *Rerum Novarum* and other encyclicals to show that only Manchester-style liberalism had been condemned by the church. His own "constructive liberalism," on the contrary, was perfectly orthodox, and could find in the Church a proud ally. "Whoever condemns socialism as *intrinsically evil*," Rougier wrote in reference to the Church, "implicitly condemns economic planning [planisme]."[21]

---

[18] Louis Rougier, *La scolastique et le thomisme* (Paris, 1925), 711, 757.

[19] Louis Rougier, *Les mystiques économiques*, 2nd edition (Paris, 1949), 70. The text of the second edition is the same as the first, published in 1938.

[20] Ibid. 133-4.

[21] Ibid. iv, 239.

To simplify matters, I will focus on Raymond Aron and Wilhelm Röpke, both of whom attended the foundational 1938 *Colloque Lippmann*. They were also, probably, the two most prominent liberal intellectuals in wartime and postwar Europe, and they both engaged in significant dialogue with Catholic interlocutors, especially after the war. Aron needs no introduction to the contemporary reader: he was doubtless one of the most important Cold War intellectuals. Röpke, although unjustly forgotten today, was a major moral compass in postwar Germany and, through his influence on Erhard, one of the architects of the social market economy. In this short section on their ideas, I will emphasize, first, their rejection of the putative hyper-rationalism of earlier liberalism; second, their theories of totalitarianism and democracy; and third, their attitude towards religion.

Raymond Aron did not follow his mentors into support for the Blum government, nor did he believe, with them, in the *a priori* virtues of democratic governance. "I will not fall, again, into the illusions of liberalism or scientism," he pointedly announced in 1937, as "there are no eternal or providential laws which could impose the permanence of a social regime."[22] This declaration was made at the opening of a long essay condemning the interventionist economic policies of Léon Blum's Popular Front administration, hinting at the inability of parliamentarism itself to solve France's political and economic woes. Two years later, he delivered an address at the Société française de philosophie, itself the chief forum of Third Republic radicalism, on "Democratic states and totalitarian states." Here he argues that, by linking democracy too closely to parliamentarism as a legal form, Frenchmen have forgotten its true essence. "I think it would be necessary," he argued, to distinguish "in the idea of democracy between that which is secondary and that which is essential.

[22] Raymond Aron, "La politique économique du front populaire (1937)," *Commentaire* 28-9 (1985), 311-26, here 312

The idea of popular sovereignty is not an essential idea."[23] Popular sovereignty, he points out, could easily lead to despotism: what is required, instead, is legality, and the presence of a public-spirited political elite, along with a public that could abandon pacifist decadence and adopt the martial virtues necessary to defend liberty in a time of war. Democracy is not a form of government, but a regime with "a minimum of respect for persons." It is, in fact, a form of conservatism.[24]

Once the war began, Aron followed de Gaulle to London, where he edited *La France Libre*; although he did not support Pétain, his support for the revolutionary, democratic tradition remained tepid. In 1944, he published an important essay on "The Future of Secular Religions." Aron argued here, as many would in the early years of the Cold War, that totalitarianism was a form of secularized Christianity, attempting to incarnate the kingdom of God here on earth, as the utopia of a class or race. In French circles, as we saw in Chapter 1, this argument had normally been made in support of the counter-revolution, especially in the circle of Charles Maurras and his Catholic supporters. Jacques Maritain and Waldemar Gurian, in addition, had made this exact argument about totalitarianism in the 1930s. It is striking that Aron's most prominent muse in this piece was not de Gaulle or even Halévy, but Georges Bernanos—a reactionary Catholic novelist, associated for years with Maurras—who is quoted three times on the dangers of totalitarianism.[25]

The central claim of the essay is not at all that *laïcité* should rise up and confront the theocratic menace (as previous French radicals from Gambetta onwards had believed), but rather that overweening rationalism was itself at fault, at least for Marxist totalitarianism. Socialists believed that, through planning, total victory could be claimed over the forces of nature. "In this sense,

---

[23] Aron, "Etats démocratiques et états totalitaires," *Commentaire* 6, 24 (1983/4), 701-19, here 709. For the character of the Société, see Stefanous Geroulanos, *An Atheism that is not Humanist Emerges in French Thought* (Stanford, 2010), 41ff.

[24] Raymond Aron, "Etats démocratiques et états totalitaires," 710.

[25] Raymond Aron, "L'avenir des religions séculières," *Commentaire* 8, 28-9 (1985), 369-83, here 375, 376, 383.

socialism is, essentially, an anti-religion." But this anti-religion is bound up with its own doctrines and dogmas and utopian visions: "from another point of view, socialism is religion exactly insofar as it is anti-religion."[26] The problem of Marxist totalitarianism is not irrationalism: it is not, say, an eruption of the ancient Russian menace. The problem with Marxism is that it is "hyper-rationalist": too convinced of the powers of human reason (it is difficult to imagine Brunschvicg or Alain writing these words). Totalitarianism, Aron writes, provides a "demonic commentary" on Nietzsche's declaration of the death of God.[27] The essay implies, but does not state, that liberalism has nothing to fear from a non-secular religion: the danger of the secular religions is that they attempt to incarnate the kingdom of God on earth, implying that those who keep God in his heaven are no danger to the state. Aron was explicit about this in a 1947 address to German students defending a chastened form of liberalism: "What are the philosophical bases of this elementary liberalism? I can perceive two: Christian faith on the one hand, and the birth of a virile humanism, which I am tempted to call a *pessimist humanism*, on the other."[28] This pessimist and virile humanism (note the language of masculinity and realism that was so central to Cold War liberalism), he'd argued in his 1944 essay, was only possible after a rejection of older humanist principles. "Without a doubt, in the twentieth century," Aron lamented, "we no longer believe, as we did in the last, in parliamentary constitutions, economic liberalism, or national sovereignty." These dreams have all collapsed and revealed the totalitarian despotism lurking behind the humanist façade. Instead, we must chasten our hopes and learn from our fears, retreating from Nietzschean cynicism to a skeptical, anti-ideological

[26] Ibid. 370.

[27] Ibid. 376

[28] Emphasis in original; address delivered in 1947, published in 1948. Raymond Aron, "Discours à des étudiants allemands," *La Table ronde* 1, 1 (Jan 48), 63-86, here 80. This might not seem so different from Halévy, who was, after all, one of the great celebrants of Methodism. In context, though, Aron is clearly referring to Catholicism (the address was delivered in Munich), about which Halévy, like other Third Republic radicals, had nothing but scorn.

politics, attuned to the specific needs of the twentieth century. Particularly, the state must intervene in the economy, but without becoming totalitarian.[29]

So with Aron we find an anti-totalitarian liberalism that is skeptical of parliamentary democracy, untrammeled reason, and the free market: the same features that animated the neoliberalism of Wilhelm Röpke. Röpke was no more smitten than Aron with the tradition of nineteenth-century liberalism. His social theory was, as Paul Nolte has argued, infused with "a romanticizing transfiguration of the past and a fundamental criticism of modernity."[30] World War II, Röpke was convinced, should lead to a rejection of "the liberalism of the past, which has become untenable."[31] It was not only empirically untenable, but logically so: Röpke, like Aron, thought that previous forms of liberalism had rested on bankrupt cosmologies of natural order.[32] He called for a "Renaissance of liberalism" which would, in light of the century's new challenges, give up the bankrupt *laissez-faire* approach in favor of a "liberal interventionism," in which the state would intervene not to control markets but to protect the preconditions of free competition.

Like Aron, Röpke was an early critic of totalitarianism; indeed, he began using the term "total state" as early as 1931, in an article attacking the *Tat-Kreis* of revolutionary conservatives.[33] He also saw the rationalism and mass-democracy of the nineteenth century, and the decline in elites, as behind the rise of totalitarianism. "Nothing spells greater danger to our entire social system," he wrote in 1933, "than the 'revolt of the masses' emancipating themselves from the leadership of an

---

[29] Raymond Aron, "L'avenir des religions séculières," 382.

[30] Paul Nolte, *Die Ordnung der deutschen Gesellschaft* 290.

[31] Wilhelm Röpke, *Civitas Humana*, 13.

[32] For the most extended neoliberal version of this critique, see, by Röpke's friend, Alexander Rüstow, *Das Versagen des Wirtschaftsliberalismus als religionsgeschichtliches problem* (Istanbul, 1945).

[33] Wilhelm Röpke, *Against the Tide*, trans. Elizabeth Henderson (Chicago, 1969), 34.

intellectual élite."[34] *Civitas Humana* (1944), Röpke's wartime opus, featured a chapter called "Errors of Rationalism," in which Röpke explains that the deification of reason is a heresy at the heart of both laissez-faire liberalism and totalitarianism.[35] Collectivism, he declared, is "the deadly danger of our entire Western [abendländischen] society."[36] So, again like Aron, his liberalism was a kind of conservatism. He even suggested dropping the term "liberalism" altogether in favor of "Westernism."[37] Liberalism, for Röpke as for Aron, is much more than an economic theory: it is, instead, "a social philosophy to which we owe all the few somewhat brighter periods of world history, from antiquity to our age, from the Stoa to Spinoa and Goethe."[38] It is not marked, primarily, by free markets, but by the protection of rights and the rule of law.

It is also, crucially, a fundamentally religious phenomenon: Christianity, Röpke argued as early as 1933, was an important moment in the genealogy of the idea of "humanity," essential to his expansively-defined liberalism.[39] In *Civitas Humana* (1944), he went even further, tying the rise of totalitarianism to a longer story of Protestantism and secularization; he approvingly cites, for instance, Maritain's work on Rousseau.[40] "Religious beliefs," Röpke explained, "are naturally an anchor of freedom." To back up this claim, peculiar for a liberal, he tells a story, following Gaetano Mosca, about the "unique position of Christian civilization." The Christian West is different from, for instance, the Islamic East in that we never developed a confusion between theology and politics.

---

[34] Ibid. 75.

[35] Röpke, *Civitas Humana* 103ff.

[36] Ibid. 33.

[37] Röpke, *Against the Tide* 83.

[38] Ibid. 75.

[39] Ibid. 91.

[40] Röpke, *Civitas Humana* 129.

Only when they are kept apart can the legal protection of the individual be assured (Villey's Mill had spun a similar tale for him). Christianity is thus an essential part of the West's liberal heritage; without the Church, Röpke claims, Europe would be no more than "an Asian peninsula."[41] The argument is not only that Christianity kept the flame of civilization alive through the Dark Ages, but, even more, that Christian, and specifically Catholic, notions of theology and politics continue to be instructive. Although some Catholics have grievously misinterpreted *Quadragesimo Anno* as a brief for authoritarian corporatism, Röpke argues that it is, instead, "clearly and completely" aligned with Röpke's own neoliberal project.[42] Louis Rougier, recall, would make the same argument a few years later. It was not only neoliberals who were convinced of Catholicism's liberal, humanist essence. Catholics themselves, and sometimes the last ones we would expect, greeted them with open arms.

Corporatist Catholicism: Neoliberalism, Federalism, and Vichy

Neoliberalism, as described above, would become central to post-1945 reconstruction. Neoliberal theory and social science came to power by way of Christian Democracy: Christian Democrats could provide the votes and the institutional heft to turn neoliberal theory into welfare-capitalist reality. This became glaringly clear in the 1940s and 1950s: as we'll see in upcoming chapters, Catholics and neoliberals hosted conferences together and collaborated at the heights of political and economic management. But it is also clear from the late 1930s, as I'll show in this section. To reiterate: this is important because it shows that the Catholic-liberal synthesis was not a matter of political convenience, or a dictate of American occupation policy (although it was, to some extent, both of these things, too). Cold War liberalism did not have to wait for Vietnam to turn towards the authoritarian. It was indifferent to democracy, *qua* political form, from its origins.

---

[41] Ibid., 194-6.

[42] Ibid., 96.

In this section, I will consider the circle around Jean de Fabrègues and François Perroux. They were, recall, leading publicists of corporatist Catholicism, arguing that Catholicism provided the proper economic theory that could save France from the twin menaces of liberalism and Communism. They both viewed the National Revolution as a breath of fresh air, and had essentially been calling for it for years; likewise, they both assumed important roles under Pétain. Perroux, for his part, served on a commission to draft Vichy's constitution, helped to found the Vichy-friendly group, *Economie et Humanisme*, founded the *Renaître* group, charged with forging the National Revolution's ideology, and participated in a dizzying area of other activities, some financed by Vichy, to defend the corporatist revolution.[43] Fabrègues was an important contributor to *Idées*, Vichy's most important cultural journal. It was edited by René Vincent, one of Fabrègues's comrades-in-arms from the *Jeune Droite*'s glory days in the 1930s; Fabrègues himself went on to found *Demain* in 1942, a Catholic newspaper funded by Vichy's Ministry of Information. Most of the economic and cultural thought contained in the wartime works of Perroux, Fabrègues and others is already familiar to us from our account of the late 1930s—they maintained their emphasis on personalism and anti-totalitarianism, for instance, and Perroux's *La Communauté* (1942) is essentially indistinguishable from the already-discussed *Capitalisme et communauté de travail* (1938). I won't, therefore, dwell on it at great length.[44]

---

[43] For a rundown of his Vichy activities, see Julian Jackson, "'Mal embarqué bien arrivé': The Strange Story of François Perroux," in *Vichy, Resistance, Liberation: New perspectives on Wartime France*, ed. Hanna Diamond and Simon Kitson (Oxford, 2005) 155-170, here 156.

[44] The manifesto that opens *Idées* trumpets Vichy, and its hierarchical, non-democratic society, as a defense of "la personne humaine." *Idées* 1, 1 (November 1941), 1-2, 2. François Gravier, "Le Respect de la Personne Humaine," appeared in the same issue (*Idées* 1, 1 (November 1941), 45-8). Jean de Fabrègues, in his opening essay, dealt with the sudden problem of his ideology's success by defusing it slightly: "The feudal and federalist spirit, were it able to replace or impregnate the state, would neither dissociate nor weaken the French community [la communauté française]." He went on to claim that "federalists like Barrès and Maurras" had not weakened the "communatarian conscience" of France, but had "rendered it more present and vital." The enemies—Rousseau and Brunschwig [sic]—remained the same, too. Fabrègues, "Qu'est-ce que la Communauté Française?", *Idées* 1, 1 (November 1941), 20-32, 22.

Instead, I'll focus on the ties between these French corporatists and the neoliberals described in the previous section. In his article opening up *Idées*—arguing that the defeat of France was a veiled opportunity to recover France's eternal glory by recalling France to its "feudal and federalist" mission—Jean de Fabrègues ends with a reference to Raymond Aron. Fabrègues cites and agrees with a passage from one of Aron's prewar essays in which he had criticized the rationalist revolutionary tradition.[45] Although this hint of an affinity between Catholic corporatism and neoliberalism was tentative— Fabrègues still refers to Aron as a "slightly suspect witness"—it had a short history and a long future. The central locus of this surprising *rapprochement* in the late 1930s was the Librairie de Médicis, a publishing house founded in 1937 at the instigation of law professors and incipient neoliberals like Louis Baudin and Louis Rougier.[46] The Librairie was ground zero of French neoliberalism in the late 1930s and beyond. Its primary task was the publication of works critical of the Soviet Union and collectivist planning generally—notably the first French translations of Friedrich von Hayek, Ludwig von Mises, and Lionel Robbins.

In the context of the time, this meant that the publishing house positioned itself squarely against the Blum government and its policy of collaboration with Thorez's PCF. This was, of course, the same motivation driving the corporatist Catholics described in Chapter 5. Perhaps for this reason, feelers between the two movements were sent out early and often. François Perroux, who published many works with the Librairie, was at the center of this collaboration. He wrote the preface, for instance, to Mises's *Le socialisme* in 1938, and had known Mises since at least 1934, when he traveled to Vienna to take part in the economist's seminars.

---

[45] Fabrègues, "Qu'est-ce que la Communauté Française?", 32.

[46] Alain Drouard, *Une Inconnue des sciences sociales: La fondation Alexis Carrel, 1941-5* (Paris, 1992), 204.

The association between the greatest Catholic corporatist—highly sympathetic, recall, to the experiments of Dollfuss and Salazar—and the voice of French neoliberalism was not unique. The Librairie published only one journal at the time: this journal was *Civilisation*, edited by none other than Jean de Fabrègues. The journal was, in fact, the central organ of the Catholic Jeune Droite in 1938 and 1939, as historians have recognized (without noting the empirical or ideological connections brewing between Catholicism and neoliberalism, which is the journal's true novelty).[47] "Whereas *liberalism* has, for many years, been the doctrine that dare not speak its name," wrote Louis Salleron in its pages in 1939, "we have seen, in the last few months, the restoration of the term."[48] *Civilisation* and its cadre of Catholic corporatists were among the most enthusiastic advocates of this *restauration*.

This was not simply a marriage of convenience, but a more fundamental alignment of aims: a desire to oppose the Popular Front, and free the economy from the constraints of collectivist planning, while simultaneously keeping the state strong enough to maintain stability and avoid the chaos of purely laissez-faire liberalism. Observers at the time noted it, too: a 1938 issue of *Politique étrangère*, for instance, provided a joint review of three works of neoliberalism (Hayek, Rougier, Lippmann) along with a work of Bouvier-Ajam (a corporatist student of Perroux's), noting the strong and surprising resemblance between the movements.[49] Gaetan Pirou wrote, in the same year, that innovations in corporatism and liberalism had the result that "the doctrines do not seem so distant from one another as they were in the nineteenth century."[50] "The reconstruction of France,"

---

[47] On the journal, see Kessler, *Histoire politique de la Jeune Droite (1929-1942)*, chapter 15, and Véronique Auzépy-Chavagnac*, Jean de Fabrègues et la Jeune Droite catholique,* Chapter 10.

[48] Louis Salleron, "Faut-il encore parler du libéralisme?" *Civilisation* 2, 10-11 (April-May 1939), 26-30

[49] André Piatier, [untitled review of Mises, *Le socialisme*, Rougier, *Les mystiques économiques*, Lippmann, *La cité libre*, Bouver-Azam [sic], *La doctrine corporative*], *Politique étrangère* 3, 6 (1938), 634-9, here 637

[50] Gaëtan Pirou, *Néo-Libéralisme, Néo-Corporatisme, Néo-Socialisme* (Paris, 1938), 176.

observed one Jeune Droite corporatist, "requires the destruction of Communism."[51] The neoliberals couldn't have put it better themselves. Likewise, and surprisingly, neoliberals were sometimes quite sympathetic to the Vichy regime. This is most clear in the case of Louis Rougier himself, who remains most famous for his high-profile diplomatic service to the Vichy regime.[52]

Louis Baudin, discussed above, was an instigating force behind the founding of the Librairie de Médicis, and also published his early works there; he can thus serve as a barometer for the publishing house's general political stance. His *L'Utopie Sovietique* (1937), one of the first publications of the Libraire de Médicis, was an attack on the Soviet experiment and on the Popular Front for spreading propaganda While previous liberals had trained their sights on clericalism, Baudin turned his on collectivism. The problem with the USSR was that it was étatiste and did not allow for the efficiency of the markets. Baudin noted worrying analogues at home: "In France, the Russian influence manifests itself primarily in an insufferable obsession with planning [*planomanie*]: all the clients at Café Commerce have their own reform program, which is simply absurd." This took on a moral component, familiar from more famous works of both neoliberalism and Catholicism: the Popular Front is importing "Asiatic conceptions […] concretized in *the mass*. The politics of the mass," Baudin continues, "is contrary to the Latin ideal which consists in the elevation of the human personality, in the constitution of an elite which attracts the mass to itself and not at all in a lowering of the elite to the level of the mass[.]"[53] Note the resonance here with earlier texts from Aron and Röpke: a new linkage of liberalism with the classical, Latin past, and a distrust of the masses in the name of elites.

---

[51] Louis Salleron, "Le problème français," *Combat* 3, 28 (October 1938), non-paginated.

[52] For more on liberalism and Vichy, see François Denord, "French Neoliberalism and its Divisions: From the Colloque Walter Lippmann to the Fifth Republic," in *The Road from Mont Pèlerin,* ed. Philip Mirowski and Dieter Plehwe (Cambridge, MA, 2009), 45-67.

[53] Louis Baudin, *L'Utopie Sovietique* (Paris, 1937), 65-6. On 66 he quotes Salazar on the impossibility of Communism.

Baudin went on, like a surprising number of French neoliberals, to support the Vichy experiment. For all of its flaws, he wagered, it was at least better than the Popular Front and its attendant Bolshevism, and laissez-faire liberalism was so bankrupt that its return was not even desirable. Baudin's own hedged support had been prefigured in his collaboration with Fabrègues's *Civilisation*, which was, probably more than any other journal, a breeding-ground for future Pétainistes.[54] He published there twice: first, a reprint of his preface to a work by Lionel Robbins, the British neoliberal, which had appeared in translation with the Librairie de Médicis in 1938; second, an essay called "The Legend of Liberalism" in a special 1939 issue devoted to new trends in liberal thought. In each, he parroted the neoliberal party line, such as it was: a twin rejection of the laissez-faire liberalism of the past, and of collectivism. In the Robbins preface, Baudin links their newly-fashioned liberalism to the "classical doctrine of Adam Smith," in an attempt to dislodge it from the fanatical liberalism of 1789 which, he argued, led straight to collectivism.[55] "The Legend of Liberalism" makes the same points, explicitly arguing that there is nothing anti-Catholic about neoliberalism. The laissez-faire liberalism of the past, Rougier contends, was certainly anti-religious in that it counseled base, individualistic egoism as the source of all-important "personal interest." Interest, though, "has nothing to do with egoism; it is familial, amical, national[.]"[56]

The invocation of the family was clearly designed to perk the ears of the journal's primarily Catholic audience. He goes on to draw other connections between neoliberalism and Catholicism: a liberal society, for instance, allows the individual to choose between good and evil, without forcing the person to pass this fundamental spiritual decision on to a bankrupt bureaucracy. "In the second

---

[54] As opposed to full-fledged Parisian collaborators, who were more likely to come from the circle around *Je suis partout*.

[55] Louis Baudin, [preface to Lionel Robbins, *L'économie planifiée et l'ordre international*], *Civilisation* 1, 6 (November 1938), 16-20.

[56] Louis Baudin, "La légende du Libéralisme," *Civilisation* 2, 10-11 (April-May 1939), 21-5, here 22.

place," he adds, "*authority* remains, and in this way individualism distinguishes itself from anarchism." He references here the neoliberal emphasis on the state as the ordering principle of the market, which sets up a firm framework of legality and property without engaging in collectivist planning. "When liberalism is understood in this way, the Church is in agreement with it: it admits the necessary character of social inequalities and opposes étatisme." Liberalism, in other words, allows for the full development of the "*personalité*."[57]

Baudin, that is, participated in the neoliberal vogue for Christianity that we see in the works of Aron and Röpke. More interesting, though, is the movement from the other direction, hinted at by the fact that Baudin was invited to publish in *Civilisation* at all, or that the journal appeared under the auspices of the Librairie de Médicis. This can be traced in the work of Maurice Bouvier-Ajam and his teacher, François Perroux. Bouvier-Ajam, one of whose corporatist works featured a preface by Baudin, was a Catholic who had supported the right-wing Ligues in February 1934. With many in his generation, he turned to corporatism at this time, and he went on to take over the Pétainiste, government-supported Institut d'Etudes Corporatives et Sociales (I.E.C.S.) under Vichy.[58] It had been founded in 1934 and revived, according to Bouvier-Ajam, by Pétain himself, who went on to funnel vast sums to the organization. A note prepared by Pétain's cabinet claimed that "there is currently no propaganda more urgent than that in favor of the *Charte du Travail* and the Corporation."[59] Implicitly, this note suggests that there was no propagandist more significant than Bouvier-Ajam.

---

[57] Ibid. 23.

[58] For this biographical information about Bouvier-Ajam, see Steven Kaplan, "Un laboratoire de la doctrine corporatiste sous le régime de Vichy: l'Institut d'études corporatives et sociales," *Le Mouvement social* 195 (2001), 35-77, here 40.

[59] Ibid. 42-3.

While Bouvier-Ajam's corporatism remained some distance away from Baudin's neoliberalism, the novel fact remains that they were operating in the same institutional-conceptual space, and that they recognized one another as brothers-in-arms. Bouvier-Ajam envisioned a somewhat more activist state than Rougier or Baudin, believing with Perroux that the state would have to occasionally intervene in the market instead of simply guaranteeing it. They were, however, both arguing that limited forms of state activism would forestall the onset of Bolshevist collectivism, and neither of them were especially concerned about the clerical/anti-clerical axis that had so divided earlier generations of French intellectuals. In a time of war and shortage, Baudin suggests in his preface to Bouvier-Ajam's central work of the period, ideally neoliberal liberal economics might not work, and the corporation might be a healthy replacement. Baudin, like other neoliberals, remained concerned to protect the market price mechanism, and was therefore critical of "corporative markets" which merely "mask étatiste control." Bouvier-Ajam's solution, which Baudin accepts with "gratitude," is the creation of a corporation of shareholders, which will provide consumers a voice in a modern economy without recourse to the state; the state itself, in this system, will merely "fulfill those functions enumerated by the classical economists." In this way, prices will "free themselves" and reach "equilibrium." Most important of all, though, is that it rests on "collaboration between the classes, it is an agent of internal peace."[60]

Bouvier-Ajam returned the favor: "it is necessary," he announces, "to renounce the liberalism of the physiocrats and their disciples and propose a *constructive liberalism*," referencing Lippmann and Hayek by name and, through his invocation of Rougier's vocabulary, the whole constellation of figures around the *Colloque Walter Lippmann*. This requires an interventionist state to protect the preconditions of the market (private property, etc.) and, quoting now from Lippmann,

[60] Baudin, preface to Maurice Bouvier-Ajam, *La doctrine corporative*, 5th edition (Paris, 1943), vii-xiv, here ix, x, xiv.

ensure that man is considered as "an autonomous person [une personne autonome]."[61] Bouvier-Ajam is especially keen on neoliberal critique of socialism, and worried about "the totalitarian intentions of Communism."[62] Alongside paeans to Catholic luminaries like Perroux and La Tour du Pin, we find Bouvier-Ajam citing the pantheon of neoliberal luminaries—Baudin, Rougier, Lippmann, Röpke, Hayek, Mises and Robbins—on their critique of socialism and the neoliberal belief in the necessity of a strong state. The rapprochment was not yet complete, however: Bouvier-Ajam is gently critical of neoliberalism, just as Baudin was gently critical of corporatism: corporatism, according to Bouvier-Ajam, is attuned with human nature, and provides the positive account of human existence and flourishing that is absent from even the most "constructive" of liberalisms."[63] The road to future collaboration, though, had been opened.

François Perroux, who served on a panoply of Vichy's cultural institutions, evinced a similar attitude towards neoliberalism. Although he was, as a friend and supporter of Mises, generally sympathetic to the neoliberal project, he thought that their vision remained too negative. One of his projects was *Economie et Humanisme*, a Catholic social-science organization that sought to bring Catholic social teachings together with the most modern social-scientific inquiry. Despite this putative modernism, the group—of which Perroux was vice-president—remained closely tied to older, Action française-style critiques of secular modernity. Manchester-style liberalism comes in for attack in the group's manifesto, just as it did in the work of neoliberals. Étatiste socialism, for its part, is "hardly better" than the liberalism it was meant to replace; it, too, leaves the fundamental

[61] Ibid., 18-9.

[62] Ibid. 26.

[63] Ibid. 31ff.

problem—the "chronic pathology" of secular modernity—untouched. "Neoliberalism," though, is better than either of these, but still not enough. Only corporatism provided a full response.[64]

Corporatism, though, was on its way out, and Catholic intellectuals after 1944 would turn towards neoliberalism in a more full-blooded way, as we'll see in the next two chapters. Corporatism in the 1930s had seemed like a living possibility, as Castelnau's FNC and the other far-right Ligues loomed large and were outspokenly in favor of corporatist economic arrangements. After 1944, though, the traditional right wing was completely delegitimized. Or even before: Fabrègues, along with much of the French population, began to turn against Pétain in 1943 and 1944. From 1944 onwards, there was no obvious star to which the French corporatists could hitch themselves, at least on the domestic scene. Catholic corporatists did not follow Maurras into sullen silence or Cassandra-style hysteria. Instead, beginning already in 1943, they began to prepare the new doctrine under whose aegis they would sail to new prominence after 1944: federalism.

Catholic corporatists became enchanted with federalism around 1944, and it was the new discourse of federalism that would pave the way towards a full Catholic-liberal synthesis after the war (as we'll see, neoliberals like Aron and Röpke were equally enchanted by the promise of federalist politics). The new forum for their intellectual energies was the circle around *La Fédération*, founded in 1944 but rooted squarely in the personnel and ideology of the National Revolution. The connections between *La Fédération* and the Catholic right of the 1930s are legion: at the very least, we could point to Robert Aron, Jean Daujat, Fabrègues, Claude Gignoux, Perroux, C.F. Ramuz, Louis Salleron, and Thierry-Maulnier.

La Fédération, founded as a Vichy journal, served as an incubator of Cold War liberalism in general: it brought the defunct ideas of Catholic corporatism into the mainstream. The Catholic

[64] "Manifeste d'Économie et Humanisme," *Économie et Humanisme* 1, 1 (Feb-March 1942), 3-22, esp. 3, 14-15.

reactionaries named above rubbed shoulders with the leading lights of neoliberalism—Raymond Aron and Wilhelm Röpke published there—alongside mainstream political actors, notably the American ambassador to France. Two of the central ideologues of *La Fédération* were Max Richard, the editor of the journal, and André Voisin, the movement's secretary-general. Their trajectories match those of Perroux and Fabrègues; they, too, show how Catholic reaction morphed into Cold War liberalism. Richard and Voisin they were both involved with the *Action française* in the 1930s. As the decade wore on, they both aligned themselves with, and wrote for the journals of, Jean de Fabrègues and the Catholic Jeune Droite. After 1940, they both welcomed the Vichy revolution and were involved with Bouvier-Ajam's I.E.C.S., but, like others, they became skeptical of the Pétain regime around 1943 and engaged in low-risk resistance activities (this would allow Fabrègues to later whitewash his own record[65]). At that time, they created the Centre technique d'organisation professionnelle, devoted to the Christianization of the labor force; this organization, in turn, was the basis for *La Fédération*, founded directly after the liberation.[66] It went on to become one of the most important Catholic journals in postwar France, and led directly to the foundation of the *Union Européenne des Fédéralistes*, the largest European federalist organization of the later 1940s. As we will see in the next two chapters, this mass-based organization was one of the central conduits through which Catholic masses came to accept the legitimacy of the post-1945 settlement. The discourse of federalism, which fit neatly into accepted canons of both Catholic and neoliberal social science, allowed for Europe's social and economic modernization under the cover of an atavistic social-economic ideology. Before turning to this phenomenon, we will complete this chapter by exploring

[65] See, for a particularly flagrant example, Jean de Fabrègues to Stanislas Fumet, 29 November 1949, Fonds Fumet, Bibliothèque National Française, NAF28071, Boîte 27.

[66] This information comes from Romain Pasquier, "L'invention de la régionalisation 'à la française' (1950-1964)", *Jounée d'études AFSP*, 8 February 2002, 1-23, here 2-3

the activities of the Catholic intelligentsia in exile, showing how they, too, embraced the new doctrine of neoliberalism.

Democracy in the Deeper Sense: Civil-Society Catholics in America and in the Resistance

While French corporatists were supporting Vichy and laying the groundwork for postwar federalism, many civil-society Catholics either joined the Resistance or rode out the war in America (many of the most prominent French resisters came from Catholic Action[67]). In our consideration of civil-society Catholicism in Chapter 4, we focused on four individuals: Jacques Maritain, Waldemar Gurian, Gaston Fessard, and Paul Landsberg. During the war, two of them—Maritain and Gurian—sought refuge in America, where they championed the anti-totalitarian cause from afar, and began to undo the traditional Catholic animus towards the United States.[68] Fessard and Landsberg entered the Resistance: Landsberg perished in Oranienburg, while Fessard became perhaps the most famous Catholic intellectual resister in France. Significantly, Maritain and Gurian were joined in America by refugees from the Austrian *Ständestaat*: Dietrich von Hildebrand, most famously, but also Aurel Kolnai (the personalist critic of Spann), Balduin Schwarz, and Carl Oskar von Soden, an old hand from the *Allgemeine Rundschau* and Bayerische Volkspartei circles of 1920s Bavaria. In this section, I will consider the ideological development of these figures during the war. In this section, I will trace their wartime histories, showing the common threads linking their wartime ideas with the civil-

[67] Pierre Pierrard, *Laïcs dans l'Église de France* (Paris, 1988), 227-37. For instance, *Les Cahiers de notre jeunesse,* a Resistance journal, was launched by Albert Cortais, secretary-general of the A.C.J.F. More broadly, Catholic Action in at least some of its many guises fought for its independence from Vichy. The JOC, for instance, successfully fought off Vichy efforts to integrate all youth movements into one, as Catholic Action had also done in Italy and Austria. Bruno Duriez, "Left Wing Catholicism in France from Catholic Action to the Political Left: the *Mouvement Populaire des Familles*," in *Left Catholicism,* 64-90, here 71.

[68] Seth Armus, "The Eternal Enemy: Emmanuel Mounier's *Esprit* and French Anti-Americanism," *French Historical Studies* 24:2 (2001), 271-305

society Catholicism of the 1930s, and also showing how civil-socity Catholics, too, were turning towards Cold War Liberalism as early as the late 30s.

One of the attendees at Raymond Aron's 1939 lecture, on the need for a revitalized democracy that would protect the person without getting hung up on popular sovereignty, was Jacques Maritain. Gaston Fessard, too, was interested in Aron's works. They had met in the Kojève seminars they both attended, and in a 1938 letter Fessard expressed both a wish to review Aron's works in *Etudes*, and a worry that he agreed so heartily with Aron that he might be unable to write without bias.[69] After the war, Aron and Fessard remained close friends. Daniel Villey, whose vision opened this chapter, got his start a *La Vie Intellectuelle*, the central organ of civil-society Catholicism, in the later 1930s.

In some cases, this approach of civil-society Catholicism towards liberalism was apparent earlier. In the absence of a credible alternative—the Ligues and the Popular Front were both outlawed by totalitarianism theory—liberalism came to seem attractive. Here's Fessard, in 1937:

> Predictably, because the bourgeois State considers the individual as an atom, as an absolute, and because it allows the individual to regulate his own life […], the Church can bear to be ignored by it. This ignorance […] is not a negation of its existence. But in the modern totalitarian state, which presumes to put all individual activities at the service of the community, and does not concede liberty apart from this service, this is no longer the case.[70]

And here is Gurian in 1932, referring to the relativist nihilism he saw at the heart of totalitarianism:

> This relativization succeeds, indeed, with the explicit recognition of Christianity as a public power, but it is nonetheless more dangerous to the Catholic than a relativization rooted in liberal humanitarianism, which treats the Church as a worldview among others.[71]

---

[69] Gaston Fessard to Raymond Aron, 26 March 1938,Fonds Fessard, Box 51, Folder A.

[70] Fessard, *La main tendue?* (Paris, 1937), 170.

[71] Walter Gerhart [i.e. Gurian], *Um des Reiches Zukunft* (Freiburg, 1932), 171.

Although comments like these remained marginal, and were overshadowed by their larger belief that bourgeois liberalism was at the very heart of totalitarianism, they do point towards the eventual political location of civil-society Catholics after 1945. In 1944, Maritain hoped that "the France of tomorrow would be *Christian and liberal*," and in a wartime article about totalitarianism Gurian approvingly quoted, of all people, Elie Halévy.[72]

Even *Christliche Ständestaat*, the house organ of Dollfuss's Christian-corporatist regime discussed in Chapter 5, found itself supporting the new liberal-Catholic synthesis in the later 1930s. One of Röpke's Swiss newspaper articles about the totalitarian menace was actually printed in Hildebrand's journal in early 1937.[73] "Yesterday, Christian conservatism struggled, above all, against liberalism and individualism," Klaus Dohrn wrote the same year. "Today collectivism, in either its brown or red shade, has become the primary concern." Like Röpke, Dohrn stresses that many liberal ideals, perverted by the strict rationality of the Enlightenment, "are truly a Christian inheritance."[74]

Civil-society Catholics became, in many cases, prominent in the French resistance. Pétain's attempt to inaugurate conservative Christian ideals within a temporal political framework stunk to many civil-society Catholics of medievalist heresy. Fessard became one of the most prominent Resistance journalists during the war, and certainly the most famous Catholic one: his *France, prends garde de perdre ton âme* (1941), the first pamphlet to appear in the clandestine *Témoignage chrétien* series, was one of the most widely-read resistance tracts in France (Maritain praised *Témoignage chrétien* in his

---

[72] Maritain radio broadcast, 3 May 1944, page 2, in Maritain Archives, Notre Dame, Box 16, Folder 8. Waldemar Gurian, "The Rise of Totalitarianism in Europe," *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1942* (Washington 1944), 297-304, here 297

[73] Wilhelm Röpke, "Andre Gide's Anklage gegen Russland und den Totalen Staat," *Christliche Ständestaat* 4, 5 (7 February 1937).

[74] Klaus Dohrn, review of R.N. Coudenhove Kalergi, *Totaler Staat—Totaler Mensch*, *Christliche Ständestaat* 4, 5 (26 December 1937), 1221-3, here 1221.

wartime radio addresses, for instance[75]). In the pamphlet, he called for resistance to Nazism, pointing out yet again its essential similarities with Communism. Landsberg, despite his friends' attempts to help him emigrate, insisted on remaining behind. As he wrote at the end of 1939,

> It is disagreeable to be dominated by a tyrannical state. But, as they say, there is always an opportunity to get along with the tyrants, and total war is doubtless more immediately, obviously, and perhaps radically dangerous for the happiness of the reasoning individual. These false individualists say: a living dog is worth more than a dead lion.[76]

Landsberg practiced what he preached: after being rounded up with other Jews in 1940, he escaped and joined the Resistance under a false name. He was then arrested by the Gestapo in 1943 and died, as a lion, in Oranienburg in 1944.[77]

Meanwhile, in America, Maritain, Gurian, Hildebrand, and others were inhabiting the American intellectual landscape in a novel way. Just as the corporatists on the continent were turning towards neoliberalism, Catholic refugees were turning towards incipient forms of Cold War Liberalism. In other words, they too were forced to look outside their own world, often for the first time. Maritain once gave an interview in a Popular-Front journal, which caused an outrage—Catholics were very much sequestered in their own public sphere in 1930s Europe. In America, things were different: one early indication was a "Program of Symposium on Political and Social Philosophy," held at Notre Dame on 4 and 5 November 1938. The symposium brought together a healthy number of these same intellectuals: "[Etienne] Gilson, you, me, [Goetz] Briefs, Gurian, this

---

[75] Jacques Maritain, "La Libération," typescript of radio braodcast, 2 September 1943, Box 16, Folder 1, Maritain Archives, Notre Dame.

[76] Paul-Ludwig Landsberg, *Problèmes du personnalisme* (Paris, 1952), 168.

[77] The details of this story are, unfortunately, lost to history. This short account is based on Oesterreicher's chapter on Landsberg in *Walls are Crumbling* and Pierre Klossowski's introduction to Landsberg, "Les Sens spirituels chez Saint Augustin," *Dieu Vivant* 11(1948) 83-105.

meeting is certainly amusing," as Simon wrote to Maritain at the time.[78] But—and here is the novelty—it also included a number of non-Catholics, most prominently Carl Joachim Friedrich and Mortimer Adler. This might not seem like much, but in fact this sort of cross-faith cooperation was remarkable, and had not been at all the norm in Europe (aside from the contemporary neoliberal Catholicism in France).[79]

Gurian received a post at Notre Dame in 1937, thanks to Maritain's machinations. He was deeply unhappy there, as his brand of Catholicism jarred with the university's traditionalism. This was evidenced most spectacularly in a 1938 controversy with Arnold Lunn about Gurian's unfashionable sympathy with Maritain regarding the Spanish Civil War (Gurian, Lunn seethed, was widely renowned on campus for his "very hostile attitude to Franco").[80] Nonetheless, he escaped Notre Dame's reactionary faculty by founding *Review of Politics* in 1939, which was one of the most important incubators of totalitarianism theory and Cold War liberalism (for both Catholics and non-Catholics). It provided an early platform for Carl Friedrich, Hannah Arendt, and Eric Voegelin, among others, and it was through his role at the *Review* that Gurian became, as one scholar deemed him, "the leading Catholic in the scholarly and scientific emigration."[81] Gurian and his review should really be considered as part of the circle at the University of Chicago that included his close friends Robert Hutchins, Jacques Maritain, Mortimer Adler, and Hans Morgenthau. Jerome Kerwin and Morgenthau attempted to get him hired at Chicago, while his archives are replete with letters

---

[78] Yves Simon to Jacques Maritain, 12 August 1938, in Maritain and Simon, *Correspondance*, 336.

[79] The exception that proves the rule is Maritain's short-lived participation with *Vendredi* in 1934: this did not even extend to doctrinal agreement, but nonetheless caused an enormous scandal. The program for this symposium is included in a 22 July 1938 letter from Jacques Maritain to Waldemar Gurian, Gurian Papers, Library of Congress, Box 5, Folder 18.

[80] This particular quotation comes from Arnold Lunn to Waldemar Gurian, 15 November 1938 which can, like all of the letters in the exchange, be found in Box 5, Folder 13, Gurian Papers.

[81] Joachim Radkau, *Die deutsche Emigration in den USA* (Düsseldorf, 1971), 187.

informing Gurian that the *Review* suffers from being linked too closely to a Catholic university.[82] As was reported in the *Notre Dame Scholastic*, the journal had more readers at Chicago than at Notre Dame anyhow.[83]

Maritain had been involved with America, and especially the University of Chicago circle, where he was particularly close with John Nef and Mortimer Adler, throughout the 1930s. "It is with great emotion that I think about the next trip to Chicago," Maritain wrote to Nef in 1938. "I have a profound sentiment of the great things that happen there, and to work under the leadership of President Hutchins and his friends will be a great joy for me."[84] "I love America," he gushed to Adler in 1940, "and I think that, along with France, it is the only country in which I could live."[85] He thought that his nation should share his newfound admiration: in 1945 he wrote that France must be "turned towards the Atlantic and the New World."[86] His affection was returned: in 1943, he had a lavish 60th birthday celebration at the Waldorf, attended by around 300 eminent figures. "Mr. Maritain understands America," Dorothy Thompson declared, "because he understands the American dream."[87]

---

[82] Alfred Guérard to Waldemar Gurian, 9 April 1946. ("It will take quite an effort for the renown of your review to outstrip that of your football.") Gurian Papers, Box 3, Folder 23. See also Jerome Kerwin to Waldemar Gurian, 9 April 1948, Gurian Papers, Box 4, Folder 21.

[83] "There are more faculty members at the University of Chicago on the subscription list than there are right here. This lack of reception locally has not deterred its editor, Waldemar Gurian. The fabulous Mr. Gurian, with the uncontrollable hair, has made the magazine what it is. He fashioned the *Review* from behind his desk in the Science Hall, where he began work on it in a room no larger than an ordinary closet." Lawrence Connor, "The Review of Politics", *Notre Dame Scholastic* 90, 1 (5 November 1948), 17-18.

[84] Jacques Maritain to John Nef, 22 April 1938, Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim, France.

[85] Jacques Maritain to Mortimer Adler, December 1940, Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim.

[86] In *A Travers la Victoire*, quoted in Jean-Luc *Barré, Jacques et Raïssa Maritain* (Paris, 1995), 433.

[87] Ibid. 430.

Maritain, who had been visiting America throughout the 1930s and had many friends there, was stranded in New York when war broke out. Tapping into his enormous pool of energy, he worked indefatigably in the exile community, writing an enormous amount for American publication, including a pamphlet for the Office of War Information that was parachuted into France. He rocketed to prestige in both America and France as the voice of eternal, Catholic France. Two officials with the United States propaganda service, in their proposal to use Maritain's writings, referred to him as the "foremost living French philosopher," adding that "he occupies a unique position. He is essentially above politics."[88] As always, Maritain jealously guarded his own independence: the Chicago and New York offices of France Forever, the American branch of Free France, both listed Maritain as a member in their publicity materials. But, as he furiously wrote in a letter of 1942, this was an error and he sought desperately to have his name removed.[89]

Dietrich von Hildebrand's circuitous path through exile led him, finally, to America at the end of 1940, where he assumed a post at Fordham thanks to Maritain's help. [90] Although not nearly as prominent in America as Maritain or Gurian—owing, perhaps, to his less certain command of the English language—he dedicated himself just as fully to the American project. Once Italy left the League of Nations in 1937, his journal had declared that the only hope for Christian, Western values lay in America.[91] Once in America, he did not have to alter his ideas overmuch to translate them into the new political context, or even stop praising Dollfuss. "Every Catholic should understand," he announced in a radio address, "that Nazism is primarily an anti-Christian movement, that it is the

[88] M. Raport and J.L. Brown, Foreign Language Section, U.S. Government Coodinator of Information, to Dr. Fry and Mr. Stanley, 7 May 1942, Maritain Archives, Notre Dame, Box 18, Folder 3.

[89] Jacques Maritain to John Nef, October 1942, Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim.

[90] Raymond Schroth, *Fordham* (Chicago, 2002), 165.

[91] [Anonymous], "Italiens Austritt aus dem Völkerbund," *Christliche Ständestaat* 4, 50 (19 December 1937), 1197-8, here 1198.

most anti-Christian Revolution the world ever witnessed."[92] He published little during this period, owing at least in part to the destruction of an anti-totalitarian volume called *The Hour of Judgment* in May 1940 (following the French invasion of Paris).[93]

This is not the place for a full account of Catholic resistance activities in America or in France; that subject deserves a book of its own. Here I would like simply to point out three major continuities with the 1930s: personalism, anti-totalitarianism, and an indifference to democracy *qua* political form. In addition to their own works, I will refer to the clearest expression of the incipient Cold War Catholicism in wartime America: *Devant la crise mondiale*, a 1942 manifesto signed by Gurian, Hildebrand, and Maritain, along with about 40 other prominent Catholic exiles (published in *Commonweal* as, simply, "Manifesto on the War"). Maritain did not write the original draft, but he did revise it substantially, and he was the point of contact for the diverse group of participants. The manifesto went through multiple drafts, with signatories coming and going as the months dragged on (one referred to the "idiot manifesto" that Maritain had been forced to salvage[94]). Hildebrand, for his part, was in charge of gathering Austrian signatories.[95] The end result was a compromise among warring tendencies within the emigré community, and very few of its signatories, least of all Gurian, were completely pleased with it.[96] It does, for all that, perfectly express the three basic features of civil-society Catholicism, and its Atlantic successor.

---

[92] Undated radio address, clearly from sometime between 1941 and 1945. In the same address, he obliquely compares Dollfuss with Christ. Nachlaß Hildebrand, Mappe XII.7.

[93] Alice von Hildebrand, *Soul of a Lion*, 302.

[94] Yves Simon to Maritain, 6 November 1941, Box 18, Folder 3, Maritain Archives, Jacques Maritain Center, Notre Dame.

[95] Dietrich von Hildebrand to Jacques Maritain, 1 May 1942, Box 18, Folder 3, Maritain Achives, Notre Dame.

[96] Waldemar Gurian to Jacques Maritain, 8 February 1942, Box 18, Folder 3, Maritain Archives, Notre Dame.

First, personalism: for all three of these figures, the "person," with all of its implicit politics, remained at the center of their moral-political imagination. In his articles (including several in Gurian's *Review*), books, and radio addresses, Maritain consistently recommended the "human person" as the subject of a healthy society, and the name of that for which we fight. For instance, in a 1943 radio broadcast he tasks both socialists and anticlerical rationalists with valuing "economic technique and the machinery of the State before the consideration of the human person."[97] Gurian, in addition to publishing a bevy of personalist articles in his own journal, wrote a popularization of Maritain's thought for another one: "The salvation of the person," he writes, "lies beyond the temporal good of society, though a rightly ordered society is not in opposition to the end of the person, but a way of attaining it."[98] Hildebrand, for his part, recapitulated his personalism in a radio address, and told his Fordham students in 1941 that the great sin of modernity, as exemplified most clearly in Nazism, was "a disrespect of the intrinsic value of the spiritual person."[99] The 1942 manifesto, the central document of Catholic discourse during the war, continually discussed "the rights of the human person."[100]

Second, anti-totalitarianism: as is fitting for the whole discourse's originators, Catholics remained at the forefront of totalitarianism theory during the war (it had, of course, begun to spread, primarily into liberal circles). Even Villey's summoned J.S. Mill warned against the danger of "totalitarianism."[101] In "The End of Machiavellianism," Maritain claimed that any politics that failed

---

[97] 30 September 1943 radio broadcast, TS in Maritain Archives, Notre Dame, Box 16, Folder 2.

[98] Waldemar Gurian, "On Maritain's Political Philosophy," *Thomist* 5 (1943), 7-22, here 11.

[99] Lecture notes for course on "Philosophy of Man," 1941-2, Nachlaß Hildebrand, Folder 51. The radio address is cited above.

[100] "Manifesto on the War," *Commonweal* 26, 18 (21 August 1942), 415-20, here 416.

[101] Villey, *Redevenir les hommes libres* lxx.

to subordinate politics to ethics would fall prey to "totalitarian rule and totalitarian spirit," which had lurked within the modern project since the despised Florentine himself.[102] Hildebrand, too, retained his earlier usage of the term as the name of the antipersonalism threatening Christian civilization: "In the present moment," he wrote in 1942, "we are called as Catholics firstly: to understand clearly what totalitarianism means."[103] The manifesto that they both signed was, above all, an anti-totalitarian cri de coeur: the first section is entitled, "Totalitarianism and Its Threat to Civilization," and the first sentence reads, "Totalitarianism, apart from certain externals, holds nothing in common with the régimes based on authority which Christian peoples have known in the past."[104]

Gurian remained the most prominent champion of totalitarian theory—which was, recall, still a nascent phenomenon at this point. He delivered an address in 1939 to the American Catholic Philosophical Association on the congenial theme of "The Totalitarian State," and wrote a report for the American Historical Association in 1942 about "The Rise of Totalitarianism in Europe."[105] Even more importantly, his *Review of Politics* became a sort of home-base for American totalitarianism theory. Two important totalitarian theorists—Hannah Arendt and Erich Voegelin—were, per their correspondence, influenced by Gurian's work of the 1930s, while both of them were provided an important early platform in the *Review of Politics*. Moreover, the most prominent totalitarianism theorist in the early Cold War—Carl Friedrich—first aired his theory in Gurian's journal.[106]

---

[102] Jacques Maritain, "End of Machiavellianism," *Review of Politics* 4, 1 (January 1942), 1-33, here 33.

[103] Dietrich von Hildebrand, "Catholicism vs. Nazism," *Belgium* 3, 1 (March 1942), 19-22, here 19.

[104] "Manifesto on the War," 415.

[105] The lecture was reprinted later: Waldemar Gurian, "The Totalitarian State," *Review of Politics* 40, 4 (October 1978), 514-27; Waldemar Gurian, "The Rise of Totalitarinism in Europe," op. cit.

[106] Hannah Arendt to Waldemar Gurian, 1 February 1942, Gurian Papers, Box 1, Folder 10. Eric Voegelin to Waldemar Gurian, 18 December 1937, Gurian Papers, Box 8, Folder 17. C.J. Friedrich, "The Greek Political Heritage and Totalitarianism," *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Apr., 1940), pp. 218-225. He had used the term before, but to my knowledge this is his first extended discussion of it (written, note, during the Hitler-Stalin alliance, which was an important moment for non-Catholic totalitarian theorists).

The most interesting thing about these Catholics in America, though, is that they retain their ambivalence about democracy, even while participating in crusading democratic rhetoric. This is possible through a revised understanding of democracy, one prefigured in Maritain's tendentious account of the democracy to come in *Integral Humanism* (see above, Chapter 4). The 1942 manifesto presents an especially clear account of this move. Is this war, the manifesto asks, a war to save democracy?

> If by the word democracy you mean the *political and social life of a community of free men*, the answer must be in the affirmative. Not so, however, if you mean thereby *some particular system or some particular political forms,* as they were known, for instance, to some European countries under pre-war conditions.[107]

Later, the manifesto more clearly links its concerns with longer traditions of social Catholic teachings: the form of government is irrelevant, but the location of sovereignty is not. The State must protect "[t]he freedom of groups and associations of a rank inferior to the State"—i.e. those groups that are a member of "civil community."[108]

This is the tack that Catholics would take during and after the war: a defense of democracy predicated on a redefinition. Interestingly, and as in *Pour le bien commun*, the manifesto was shunned by dyed-in-the-wool Christian Democrats like Luigi Sturzo. His letter to Maritain defending his abstention—doubtless as painful for Maritain as Blondel's similar refusal to sign *Pour le bien commun* eight years earlier—is worth quoting at length:

> For me, a leader of Christian democracy […], it would be extremely difficult to accept the definitions and limitations proposed in the document. I had opposed individualist democracy, but if it were necessary to choose between that and any authoritarian regime, I would be for the former[.] […] There is, moreover, an anti-parliamentarian reservation that seems equivocal: no modern democratic system would be possible without a legislative parliament.[109]

[107] "Manifesto on the War," 415.

[108] Ibid. 418.

[109] Sturzo to Maritain [original in French], 8 March 1942, Maritain Archives, Notre Dame, Box 18, Folder 5.

This same language is familiar from the 1930s, most famously in Maritain's *Integral Humanism*. The Maritain of 1936, recall, had been able to defend a "personalist democracy" only by denuding the word of its commonly-accepted valence—democracy as a form of governance—and replacing it with one more suitable for the Catholic. Democracy, in its new guise, was that form of government that protects "persons": a "community of free men," whatever "particular political form" they saw fit to use. John Nef, Maritain's close friend at the University of Chicago, and one of the founders of the Committee on Social Thought, prefigured this wartime phenomenon when he wrote to Maritain in 1936,

> There are already signs of a growing consciousness in France and the United States that both Communism and Fascism are false roads, and that the cause of Democracy—in the deeper sense—is a good cause even though the older liberalism, which the atheists try to identify with Democracy, has failed us.[110]

Maritain remained the most distinguished force behind this Leonine redefinition, but Hildebrand, Gurian, and others spoke in the same way. In Hildebrand's consideration of "What is at Stake" in the war, he clarifies that the war is not a defense of the American life, nor is it, precisely, a war of democrats against non-democrats. He defines the true nature of the war in two ways, one of which is unsurprising: first, he defines it as a war of anti-personalism against personalism. Although written now in English, and for a new reason, his conception of *Antipersonalismus* as the sin of Nazism and Bolshevism dates from the mid-1930s, as we saw in Chapter 5. But he adds a new definition, surprising for a recovering *Ständestaat* propagandist and explicable only in terms of his new context: the war pits totalitarianism against true democracy, "that is to say the observation of

[110] John Nef to Jacques Maritain, 6 December 1936, Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim.

the God-given limits of the competency of the state and the inalterable rights of the individual and other communities (family, church, marriage)."[111]

Gurian was influential primarily as editor of his widely read *Review*, where, in addition to Maritain himself, he published many sympathetic voices. "The modern defense of democracy and liberalism," wrote one of his contributors, in the Maritain/Truman vein, "is a defense of the great intellectual achievements of the past. Our ideology is a phase of that cultural continuity which is represented in both the ideals of the Church and of the rights of man."[112] In his own writings, Gurian came to defend democracy only fitfully, and it was doubtless the war itself that hardened his beliefs. In the 1939 lecture on "The Totalitarian State," referred to above, Gurian is clear that there are more forms of governance on earth than "totalitarianism" and "modern democracies": "the assumption that the totalitarian state is the alternative of modern democracy is erroneous."[113] In fact, as Gurian had been arguing for years, these two were continuous with one another. "Common Good," he glossed elsewhere, "should be the aim of all regimes and societies. The emphasis on Freedom is not central for each good regime."[114]

As the war began, however, he began to argue that, in present conditions and despite the Church's continued indifference towards political regimes, modern democracy was, in fact, the only viable alternative to totalitarianism and thus deserved Catholic support. In a 1940 article in his *Review of Politics*, Gurian issues a clarion call for democracy: the first such brief, for any political form, that he had ever written. The same Gurian who had once argued (off the record, of course) for Wirth to

---

[111] Hildebrand, "What is at Stake," Nachlaß Hildebrand, XII.7. It's not clear exactly what this is: presumably a lecture or draft of an article. Regardless, it was doubtless written by Hildebrand during the war.

[112] Francis G. Wilson, "The Structure of Modern Ideology," *The Review of Politics* 1, 4 (October 1939), 382-99, here 398.

[113] Gurian, "The Totalitarian State," 516.

[114] Gurian, "The Political and Social World of Our Time," *Review of Politics* 5, 1 (January 1943), 120-6, here 124.

establish a dictatorship in Weimar now claimed that non-liberal, non-democratic movements were bound to be swallowed up by the totalitarian menace. Traditional authoritarianism—Gurian refers to the traditional conservativisms of Germany and Italy, but Pétain and Dollfuss lurk between the lines—is a dead project: "The totalitarian movements are superior to all anti-liberal and anti-democratic moderate and conservative groups, because they have a conscious relation to the masses."[115] In effect, he reverses his claim of the previous year that the totalitarianism/democracy division was over-simplifying. The month after the fall of France, Gurian's world of nuanced grays crystallized into one of black and white. But his acceptance of democracy remains hedged by an account of the spiritual revival it would require: "Not just a democratic legalism but an intensification of the belief in liberty, in individual rights, and in the diversity of social groups, will pronounce the last word on the future of democracy."[116] Like other Catholics, Gurian here evinces a desire to refigure democracy as something other than legal form: after all, Catholics were still bound by the Leonine injunction to remain neutral in those matters. Democracy is not a matter of law, but of rights and "diversity of social groups" (i.e. protection of family and other subsidiary non-state groups).

The most prestigious thinker in this regard was Jacques Maritain, praised by Gurian in 1943 as "the most prominent spokesman of those Catholics who looked for a new democracy under Christian inspiration."[117] The Office of War Information thought so, too: Maritain was commissioned to write a pamphlet on "Christianity and Democracy," which was parachuted into France. This "new democracy" was, rhetoric aside, indistinguishable from the "personalist

---

[115] Gurian, "Trends in Modern Politics," *Review of Politics* 2, 3 (July 1940), 318-36, here 329

[116] Ibid. 336.

[117] Gurian, "On Maritain's Political Philosophy," 8.

democracy" of *Integral Humanism* (1936). "We are looking on," Maritain declares, "at the liquidation of the modern world—of that world which was led by Machiavelli's pessimism to regard unjust force as the essence of politics."[118] Like Gurian, he emphasized a new lack of trust in traditional conservatism, which he referred to as a "moderate Machiavellianism": devoted in some sense to the *bien commun*, but prepared to use unjust means to reach it (only Richelieu and Bismarck are mentioned by name, but Pétain is surely meant, too). The secular nineteenth century, though, had prepared the "absolute Machiavellianism" of the totalitarians, devoted to nothing but the boundless pursuit of power. Traditional conservatives were "overcome and thrown away."[119]

Just as he had argued in *Antimoderne* (1921) and *Integral Humanism* (1936), Maritain argued that the modern project—which he linked, in 1944 as in 1921, with Rousseau and the anthropocentric ideals of 1789—was coming to a crashing end, and that only a renewed Christian humanism could salvage Western civilization. As he had done for some time, Maritain was clear that the modern project had brought with it certain gains, notably that "civil society" has achieved its "autonomy."[120] But these gains are overwhelmed by tragic loss, and Maritain remains skeptical of modern European liberalism: "The tragedy of the modern democracies," he writes, "is that they have not yet succeeded in realizing democracy."[121] This is because they have not understood the proper nature of democracy. Democrats continue to believe, Maritain writes, that democracy is a matter of law and constitutional form. Like Gurian, Hildebrand, and the signatories to the manifesto (and unlike Sturzo), Maritain argued otherwise: democracy is a philosophy, a state of mind, and a commitment to the rights of the person. "Thus a monarchic regime," Maritain concludes with a

[118] Maritain, *Christianity and Democracy*, 21.

[119] Maritain, "The End of Machiavellianism," *Review of Politics* 4, 1 (January 1942), 1-33, here 11-13.

[120] Ibid. 22.

[121] Ibid. 25.

flourish, "can be democratic."[122] Like Gurian and Hildebrand, and all totalitarian theorists of the 1930s, Maritain continues to condemn nineteenth-century liberalism, which "paved the way for totalitarianism."[123]

Maritain's writings on democracy were matched, almost word for word, by the pope himself, in his epochal Christmas message of 1944. For all of the celebration this message has occasioned, it is worth returning to it to see how deeply conservative its message truly is. This is one of the only places that Pius XII evinced any particular regard for democracy, and even here it is deeply hedged. Pius begins his discussion, characteristically, with Leo's command for political agnosticism, before turning, like Maritain, to a deeply hedged notion of democracy. Democracy is not about political form, Pius instructs: "democracy, taken in the broad sense, admits of various forms, and can be realized in monarchies as well as in republics." Democracy is not about political form at all, much less is it about state control of the economy: on the contrary, it is about the life of "the people" expressing itself organically through an elite group of representatives. Pius as ever emphasizes that the state should remain weak—unless, that is, we are talking about "Absolute Monarchy," which he explicitly leaves out of the discussion.[124]

Like others, Pius XII was studiously silent on issues of economic justice, and did not mention the traditional anti-capitalism of Catholic social theory. The *rapprochment* with America and democracy required a reinterpretation of capitalism, matching the new forms of capitalism theorized by the neoliberal Catholics across the ocean. The 1942 manifesto, *Devant la crise mondiale*, included a section entitled, simply, "Capitalism is not the issue at stake in this war." The main purpose of the

---

[122] Ibid. 33.

[123] Ibid. 72.

[124] Pius XII, "Democracy and a Lasting Peace," available here: http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Pius12/P12XMAS.HTM, paragraph 16 passim.

section is to disprove the Marxist assertion that the war is no more than a cipher for plutocratic interests. The manifesto denies this: the war is, after all, about totalitarianism and the freedom of the person. The war's aims and true nature are not economic, but political and spiritual. And although unrestrained capitalism is, indeed, evil and anti-Christian, it has also "greatly contributed to the development of the material elements of civilization" and, unlike totalitarian Bolshevism, allowed the individual to assert his "independence." "The errors, failings, contradictions of Christian principles, springing from capitalism," therefore, "are themselves certainly *less radical and less 'total' than those of totalitarian doctrines and régimes*."[125]

Although one would be hard-pressed to find manifestly pro-capitalistic arguments in the writings of Gurian or Maritain, their generally pro-American stance led them to, at the very least, cease explicitly attacking capitalism, as they had both done in the interwar period. Gurian shied away from economic issues, but his interest in politics and civilizational crisis led him to consistently critique the Marxist account of National Socialism as a deformation of capitalism. Instead, both Marxism and Nazism were end-results of secularization, political nihilism, and, more proximately, the destabilization of WWI; capitalism was no more than a side-effect, for Gurian and, as he emphasized in a discussion of Schumpeter, Marxism is more a "pseudo-theological, anti-religious" system than an economic one.[126] Maritain, for his part, was more explicit: in his essay on Machiavellianism, he emphasized that politics, as a branch of ethics, partakes of the logic of prudence. For Maritain, as an Aristotelian-Thomist, this distinguishes the messy world of ethics from that of divine, metaphysical truth: ethics must, even while not succumbing to the dictates of

[125] "Manifesto on the War," 416. Emphasis in original.

[126] See, for instance, Gurian's widely read "The Sources of Hitler's Power," in which he discusses secularization and democratization while dismissing Marxist theories of Nazism *qua* monopoly capitalism run amok. Waldemar Gurian, "The Sources of Hitler's Power," *The Review of Politics* 4, 4 (October 1942), 379-408, here 381, 3. For the discussion of Schumpeter and Marxism, see Waldemar Gurian, "The Political and Social World of Our Time," *The Review of Politics* 5, 1 (January 1943), 120-6, here 122.

the world, at least take it into account and act without ignoring context. Maritain turns this into a justification for social inequalities, which must be defended, even if unjust, because of the evils inherent in any egalitarian politics. Political realism requires "the recognition of the *fait accompli* […] which permits the retention of long ago ill-gotten gains, because new human ties and vital relationships have infused them with new-born rights, [and which] are in reality ethically grounded."[127]

So here we have a typology of Atlantic Catholicism as it developed during the war: personalism, anti-totalitarianism, and a hedged support of democracy, capitalism, and America as alternatives to the twin totalitarianisms battling over a ruined Europe. Here, finally, is Cold War Catholicism. This is the fruit of a longer development, traced in the previous two parts of the dissertation. According to this Catholic tradition, the heresy of modernity is not primarily economic, but political. The crisis is not one of capitalism, but of sovereignty, and its most poisonous fruit not the monopolistic trust but the sovereign nation-state. "And this is no longer a *war of ideology*," Maritain announced in a lecture at the New School in 1940. "We are very tired—too tired—of grand words, even the best of them." Christianity and democracy, the two keywords of Maritain's postwar career, have been shuttled out of the realm of ideology into that of "very simple things, very concrete and very elementary, about which there is no possibility of compromise."[128] And whether or not we think this is the operation of ideology *par excellence*, these grand words would, a few years later and with Maritain's help, come to legitimate the Cold War and the enthusiastic participation of Atlantic Catholicism.

---

[127] Jacques Maritain, "The End of Machiavellianism," 28.

[128] Jacques Maritain, "Le Christianisme et la Guerre," TS of an address given 18 April 1940 at the New School, Box 4, Folder 1, Maritain Archives, Notre Dame, here page 2.

Chapter 7: "God Exists, Therefore You May Not Be a Communist": The Rise and Fall of Left-Catholicism, 1944-50

In the concentration camps, and in the backrooms of the inner emigration, oaths were sworn.
--Walter Dirks, 1950[1]

Every action, in the middle of the twentieth century, presupposes and involves the adoption of an attitude with regard to the Soviet enterprise.
--Raymond Aron, 1955[2]

Ich bleibe, der ich bin.
--Motto appended to the *Tagesbuch* of the young Eugen Kogon[3]

Introduction

World War II radically changed the fields in which Catholics were operating: Europe in 1944 was no longer the Europe of 1934, as old quarrels had subsided and American troops held sway across a destroyed continent. The various reactionary solutions that had proven so attractive to generations of Catholics were, suddenly, off the table. Over the next few years, a new and stable postwar consensus would shake itself out, preparing Europe for decades of prosperity and peace. This stability did not, however, spring fully-armed from the thigh of war. Europe in the late 1940s was a place of competing armies and competing ideas: of the three transnational political cultures that had arisen in the 1930s, only one of them—Fascism—was truly defeated. The Socialist and Catholic Internationals lived on, and were noisily rebuilding their parties and their periodicals. The American and Soviet forces remained in Europe *en masse*, while Europe's citizens worked to solve the mountains of problems—refugee crises, war orphans, industrial destruction, anti-collaborationist violence, and more—that had been left in the war's wake. While the stable, Cold War Europe that

[1] Walter Dirks, "Der Restaurative Charakter der Epoche," *Frankfurter Hefte* 5, 9 (September 1950), 942-54, here 947.

[2] Quoted Judt, *Postwar* 197.

[3] As reported in Kogon, *Dieses merkwürdige, wichtige Leben*, 31.

emerged in the 1950s seems now like a *fait accompli*, it was anything but. In the next two chapters, we will see how Catholics interacted with Socialists and Americans, playing an important role in the construction of Cold War Europe.

There were two competing visions of Europe in the late 1940s: we might call them Resistance Europe and Atlantic Europe. Millions of Europeans were inflamed by the possibilities of the new order that might arise out of the war's ashes. The war, many thought, might serve as a new Europe's baptism by fire—a Europe of economic justice that would, through a revitalized and inclusive socialism, forestall the twin crises of capitalist collapse and authoritarian politics that had doomed Europe in the previous post-war period. The Resistance, which had kept alive Europe's ancient flame, would provide both the ideas and the personnel for a Resistance Europe. This Europe, though, failed to appear, ravaged as it was by the geopolitical imperatives of an emergent Cold War order—an order in which Communists could not take part, rupturing the already shaky wartime alliances that were to forge Resistance Europe. By 1949 or so, the outlines of a different Europe had taken shape: a Europe divided into two, in which Western Europe turned away, both politically and ideologically, from the Stalinism of the East and towards Washington's lucrative embrace. The novel alliances forged in the war and its aftermath crumbled as a series of basically conservative parties came to power across Western Europe, committed more to stabilization and cautious reform than to triumphant nationalizations and radical uprooting of the bourgeois order. "The ancient hopes which flowered and opened out in 1945," John Berger writes, "had been betrayed."[4]

The two chapters in part III will be dedicated to Catholic participation in the imagination and political reality of both Resistance and Atlantic Europe. It will be argued that, due to the history

[4] John Berger, *Hold Everything Dear* (New York, 2007), 85.

of Catholic thought traced in previous chapters, Catholics were far more interested in and ideologically prepared for the liberal, democratic Europe of the Cold War than they were for Resistance Europe. The last chapter showed Catholics edging closer to neoliberals and to Americans, well before the end of World War II: these moves would bear fruit in the late 1940s, as Catholic-liberal synthesis would truly blossom, as the socialists were frozen out. The narrative of part III looks like this: a brief efflorescence of Catholic left-ism between 1944 and 1947, succumbing to an enormous reassertion of Catholic liberalism, in an Atlantic key, between 1947 and 1950.

Throughout what follows, it is important to keep in mind that the Catholic Church, and Catholic political culture more broadly, *mattered* during these years, more than it would before or after.[5] This is obvious in places like Germany, Austria, Italy, and Belgium, where Christian Democratic parties came to power. Even in France, the Catholic participation in the Fourth Republic would have been unthinkable in the Third. While the French Christian Democratic Party itself dwindled in significance, it remains the case that 4 of the first 12 prime ministers were Catholics, while Catholics retained a stranglehold on the Foreign Ministry during the Republic's first decade in existence. In the most pregnant symbolic event of the Liberation—the August 1944 victory parade in Paris—it was two Catholics, de Gaulle and Bidault, who led the march down Champs-Élysées.

---

[5] Although the literature on postwar Catholic societies and cultures is still in its infancy, historians have broadly recognized the new salience of religiosity. See, for instance, Judt, *Postwar* 227 for this admission from a historian predisposed to downplay the role of religion, and conservatism, in post-1945 European history. Research in Germany, where the Church's relevance was unmistakable, is somewhat more developed than in France: Mark Ruff and Dagmar Herzog, alongside all of the contributors to the collection *Siegerin in Trümmern,* have integrated the Church back into the story of German modernization. Research on France is less developed: in 1997, Étienne Fouilloux called post-WWII Catholic life a "historiographical no man's land." Since then, the situation has improved somewhat, notably in the works of Denis Pelletier and Fouilloux himself. Dagmar Herzog, *Sex After Fascism*, esp. Chapter 2; Köhler and van Melis, eds, *Siegerin in Trümmern: Die Rolle der katholischen Kirche in der deutschen Nachkriegsgesellschaft* (Berlin, 1998); Étienne Fouilloux, *Les chretiens français entre guerre d'Algérie et mai 1968* (Paris, 2008) and *Les Chrétiens français entre Crise et Liberation 1937-1947* (Paris, 1997) (259 for the quotation given here); Denis Pelletier, *La Crise Catholique* (Paris, 2002); Mark Ruff, *The Wayward Flock* (Chapel Hill, 2004).

The Church explored new areas of soft power in the postwar years (including France's first televised mass, in 1948[6]). "The temporal power of Pope Pius XII," Roger Garaudy wrote in 1949, "is so great that it is—in a certain measure—comparable to that of Pope Innocent III. […] The forms of this temporal power have obviously evolved."[7] In particular, the Church exercised power through its alliances with the Americans, which will be explored in the next chapter, and through its control over historical memory. This is a huge topic, heretofore largely ignored in the literature: there is space here only to note that, through a bevy of publications and papal pronouncements, the Church tried, quite successfully, to create an image of itself as the one major institution that had been stridently opposed to both Nazism and Communism throughout the war.[8] The Pope occupied a newly-central place in diplomacy and in public discourse, as his post-1944 pronouncements positioned him as an iconic figure, familiar from the prewar past, generally supportive of democracy and clear of obvious collaborationism: a set of attributes in short supply in Western Europe at the time.

This chapter will focus on the rise and fall of the Catholic left, chronicling the participation of Catholics in the political culture of Resistance Europe, as well as their participation in its collapse (from the perspective of the *longue durée* covered in the dissertation, the latter phenomenon is more

---

[6] Marcel Albert, *Die katholische Kirche in Frankreich in der vierten und fünften Republik* (Freiburg, 1999), 30.

[7] Roger Garaudy, *L'Eglise, le Communisme et les Chrétiens* (Paris, 1949), 9.

[8] In France, this was more a matter of political culture on the ground, as will be explored below; the hierarchy was, for the most part, too compromised by Pétain for the institutional Church to portray itself as a strident resisting force. Maritain, though, did help to cleanse the French hierarchy of Pétainistes, an important step in constructing the image of a new and democratic Church (Jean-Luc Barré, *Jacques et Raïssa Maritain*, 443). In Germany, Hitler's evident distaste for Catholicism, and the absence of high-profile ecclesiastical support, allowed the myth of an anti-Nazi Church to spread. This centered around the figures of Cardinal Konrad von Preysing and Bishop Clemens August Graf von Galen. Reprints of their work were reprinted very quickly, to rapturous reviews from the press (this extended to France: see, for instance, Preysing, "Bref compte-rendu de la lutte de l'Eglise catholique contre le national-socialisme," *Documents* 2, 5 (1946), 1-7). Their works were supplemented by a series of volumes, *Das Christliche Deutschland, 1933 bis 1945*, which publicized cherry-picked anti-Nazi texts. The most important figure in this regard was the controversial Johannes Neuhäusler, whose *Kreuz und Hakenkreuz* (München, 1946), was the most important single volume in constructing the myth of a Resistance Church.

significant, and will receive greater coverage). In 1946, a journalist at *Fränkische Presse* declared that the coming *rapprochement* between socialists and Catholics represented the biggest change in Catholic doctrine since the founding of the Church.[9] Given the anti-clerical history of the continental left, the very existence of such a phenomenon as left-Catholicism casts familiar markers of "left" and "right" into question: I will define "left Catholicism" as a form of Catholic religiosity that seeks both the nationalization of key industries and collaboration with specifically Marxist socialism. These were the factors that truly distinguished left-Catholicism from other forms.

This terrain has, of course, been charted before, and in far more detail than I can offer here: monographs might be or have been written on Catholic trade unions, Catholic newspapers, the formation of Christian Democratic parties, and more. What is missing, though, and what I seek to contribute, is an understanding of left-Catholicism as a transnational political culture. We have studies of left-Catholic political parties, and left-Catholic phenomena like the miniscule "worker-priest" program or the far larger *Mouvement populaire des Familles*.[10] We have histories of the church hierarchy in these years, and of the Vatican's diplomacy. But what is lacking, for this period as for the interwar period, is a history of Catholicism as a transnational political culture: as a vocabulary for understanding politics that developed in a transnational way, primarily in the periodical press. This chapter will attempt to provide one. While for the sake of brevity and continuity I'll be focusing on France and Germany, it should not be forgotten that the story is Europe-wide: this narrative might be expanded to include, for instance, the *Union Démocratique Belge* or the *Movimento dei Cattolici Comunisti*.

---

[9] T. Yost, "Revision der chrislichen Lehre." *Fränkische Presse*, 15 January 1946, page 3. Articles like this were common in 1946. See, for another example, A. Süsterhenn, "Chrislicher Sozialismus?" *Rheinischer Merkur* 1, 48 (27 August 1946), 1-2.

[10] We should not forget that there were never more than about one hundred worker priests in France, or eight in Belgium. Gerd-Rainer Horn, "Left Catholicism in Western Europe in the 1940s," in *Left Catholicism*, 13-44, here 35.

Walter Dirks, Emmanuel Mounier, and the Rise of Left-Catholicism

Walter Dirks and Emmanuel Mounier were the figureheads of left-Catholicism in the late 1940s, and this section will consider them and their journals together (strangely, this has never been done, despite the fact that they were in contact and followed such similar trajectories). They were both full of hope in the immediate postwar period, filling their sails with the optimism of the Resistance. The Church itself was cautiously at one with them: Cardinal Suhard released a statement in 1944 declaring that the Church "denounces the proletariat as a wound … and as the proletariat seems to be a direct product of the liberal capitalist regime, how could the Church not desire that this regime be structurally transformed?"[11] They were the most influential left-Catholic organs of the late 1940s: *Frankfurter Hefte,* with the blessing of the occupying authorities, was one of the publishing success stories of the period, with circulation of up to 75,000 copies.[12] *Esprit*, although it was not the runaway publishing success of its Rhenish counterpart, was nonetheless highly successful in these years, emerging as a major left-wing voice in a crowded leftist scene.

They were each helmed by figures already known in the Catholic public sphere: Emmanuel Mounier, as we saw in Chapter 4, was one of the most infamous Catholic writers of the 1930s. Although he famously described himself as "neither right nor left," there is no doubt that he was closer to the left than to the right in the 1930s.[13] Walter Dirks had established his leftist chops with

---

[11] Quoted André Deroo, *L'épiscopat français dans la mêlée de son temps* (Lille, 1955), 115.

[12] In its internal memoranda regarding paper supplies, OMGUS designated *Frankfurter Hefte* as a "priority German magazine." "List of Priority German Magazines," OMGUS, Publications Control Branch, 6 February 1948, Information Control Division, Records of the Press Branch, 260/390/42/19/4, Box 238, Folder 48.

[13] Mounier has been so poorly served by recent historiography that it is worthwhile to look at his career objectively. John Hellman, Seth Armus, and Zeev Sternhell have tried to turn Mounier into a proto-fascist, in an attempt to correct our understanding of Mounier as a left-wing figure. After their work, however, this putatively naïve original understanding has vanished: Mounier is no more and no less than a fascist in recent historiography, and Seth Armus makes the absurd claim that *Esprit*'s politics were no different from that of Maulnier and Fabrègues' *Combat* (Seth Armus, "The Eternal Enemy: Emmanuel Mounier's *Esprit* and French Anti-Americanism." *French Historical Studies* 24:2 (2001), 271-305, 275n12). Maulnier had been a fervent supporter of the Stavisky riots, and had even been leading divisions in the street himself; in the manifesto-wars of the mid-1930s, Mounier was allied with either civil-society Catholicism or left-wing

less ambiguity: as we saw in Chapter 2, he began his career in the left-Catholic circle of Friedrich Dessauer, and he was well-known through his editorial work at *Rhein-Mainische Volkszeitung*. In the early 1930s, he was one of few Germans, and even fewer Catholics, to engage seriously with the work of Lukács and the young Marx.[14]

In France, left-Catholics were largely aligned with *tripartisme*, the political expression of the fevered *resistancialisme* that was sweeping the nation's political culture.[15] *Tripartisme* refers to the three-party coalition that governed France from 1944 to 1947, consisting of the French Communist Party [PCF], the socialists [SFIO], and the Christian Democratic *Mouvement républicain populaire* [MRP]. Catholic-Communist collaboration had, as we saw in Part II, been attempted before: in 1937, Maurice Thorez had "extended a hand" to the Catholics, only to be completely rebuffed. This time, however, the hand was tentatively accepted, as Catholics and Communists both tended the flame of Resistance. Georges Bidault, who had been a marginal Christian Democrat in the 1930s, emerged as chairman of the vaunted, Communist-friendly *Conseil National de la Résistance* [CNR] and a major figure in the MRP. Catholic voters, meanwhile, flocked to the MRP, which enjoyed astonishing electoral successes in 1945 and 1946. And while the party has been seen as one of a number of

---

anti-fascism—*never* the Maurras-inspired reaction of Maulnier. In the landscape of 1930s French Catholicism, Mounier was doubtless a man of the left insofar as he was political at all, and contemporary Catholics—including those in the Jeune Droite, who reviled him and certainly did not embrace him as one of their own—considered him as such. See, for instance, the judgment of Robert Francis, a *Jeune Droite* polemicist, in "Trois idées révolutionnaires", *Revue française* 28 (1933), 90-106, here 92-3. See also Maritain's letter to Fumet, 8 November 1937, Fonds Fumet, Boîte 28, saying that now that Mounier has been added to the list of collaborators of *Temps Présent*, a right-winger—Maritain recommends Fabrègues—must be added to balance it out. If Maritain considered that there was no essential difference between Fabrègues and Mounier, this recommendation would be senseless. Arnaud Dandieu too derisively considered Mounier a man of the left (Christian Roy, *Alexandre Marc et la jeune Europe (1904-1934)* (Nice, 1999), 390). And finally, as Alexandre Marc wrote to Mounier, "A tort ou à raison, Esprit est situé à gauche." Marc to Mounier, 21 January 1939, Fonds Marc, Folder AM 124. Of course, critics of Mounier can always point to his service in Vichy. This has been overblown, in my opinion, and anyway it is absurd to hinge our interpretation of a decades-long, mercurial career on a period of collaboration that was short-lived, ended in arrest, and was anyway more complex than usually admitted. See Michel Bergès, *Vichy contre Mounier* (Paris, 1997) on all of this.

[14] Ulrich Bröckling, *Katholische Intellektuelle in der Weimarer Republik* (München, 1993), Chapter 6.

[15] Henri Rousso, *Le syndrome de Vichy* (Paris, 1987); B.D. Graham, *The French Socialists and Tripartisme, 1944-1947* (Toronto, 1965).

"bourgeois" parties duking it out in the mind-bogglingly complex politics of the French Fourth Republic, it was also, at least at its origins, a party that was seriously trying to forge a socialist France, in the name of the Resistance.[16]

While I'll be focusing on political culture, it should not be forgotten that this experiment had significant impact on the ground. Inspired largely by the pathbreaking volume, *France, pays de mission?* (1943), French Catholics became obsessed with reaching and converting the working classes. As in Germany, left-Catholicism was leavened by the Catholic trade unions: a third of the MRP's national leadership came from the *Confédération française des travailleurs chrétiens* [CFTC].[17] The *Mouvement populaire des familles*, a mass Catholic Action movement, found itself allied with socialist and Communist trade unions by 1947.[18] Although the embryonic worker-priest movement has received more attention, the MPF was a far more significant phenomenon, reworking the Catholic Action legacy of the JOC for a new era and expandings its reach to adulthood. *Jeunesse de l'Église*, a Dominican movement with roots in the 1930s, rose to prominence in the postwar period and began dabbling in Marxism while evangelizing in the *banlieue.*[19]

The MRP was, and understood itself to represent, a break with Catholic tradition. Its first manifesto declared, time and again, "We want a revolution." "We must not allow the genesis of the Movement," the party's executive committee announced in 1946, "to be explained solely by '50 years of Social Catholicism'. Without the resistance, there would be no MRP."[20] The MRP was

---

[16] This point is adroitly made in Isser Woloch, "Left, Right and Centre: The MRP and the Post-War Moment," *French History* 21 (2007), 85-106; see also Richard Vinen, *Bourgeous Politics in France, 1945-51* (New York, 1995), Chapter 10.

[17] Jean-Claude Delbreil, "The French Catholic Left and the Political Parties," in *Left Catholicism*, 45-63, here 55.

[18] Bruno Duriez, "Left Wing Catholicism in France from Catholic Action to the Political Left: the *Mouvement Populaire des Familles*," 64-90, esp. 80-1.

[19] Thierry Keck, *Jeunesse de l'Église* (1936-55), *aux sources de la crise progressiste en France* (Paris, 2004), Part II.

[20] Quoted Woloch, "Left, Right and Centre: The MRP and the Post-War Moment," 89

stocked with members of de Gaulle's cabinet: in addition to Bidault, voters could look to François de Menthon, Robert Prigent, or Pierre-Henri Teitgen. Although the party did not shy away from its Catholic faith, and fought tooth-and-nail for traditional Catholic issues in educational policy and elsewhere, the MRP's political-social program was miles from mainstream political Catholicism as it had existed in the 1930s. The party was bound to the groundbreaking program of the CNR, thereby linking it to left-Catholicism as I've defined it: the whole project of the CNR assumed collaboration between Catholics and Marxists, while the CNR program called for wide-ranging nationalization of key industries. The desired revolution, the MRP manifesto continued, "requires on the social level […] a new reorganisation of private property."[21] "Only the state," declared one official document of the governing coalition, "is able to act according to a general plan and compel the collieries to participate in the reconstruction of French industry."[22] This was signed by Catholic ministers, in addition to the expected socialists and Communists.

While Mounier and his journal became skeptical of Christian Democracy and the MRP, it was nonetheless, as Michel Winock has emphasized in his political history of the journal, a central journal of the spirit of resistance-style *tripartisme*.[23] The central connection between the new *Esprit* and the resistance was Jean-Marie Domenach, a prodigious 23-year-old editor at *Esprit* and veteran

---

[21] Quoted in Gerd-Rainer Horn, "Left Catholicism in Western Europe in the 1940s," 19.

[22] Quoted in N. S. Timasheff, "Nationalization in Europe and the Catholic Social Doctrine", *The American Catholic Sociological Review*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (Jun., 1947), 111-130, 118.

[23] As Jean Lacroix lays out the Esprit critique of the MRP., the problem was that, despite its rhetoric, it was not revolutionary enough: dependent on the votes of right-wingers, it would either become a standard center-right party, or de-confessionalize altogether. Lacroix, "Les Catholiques et la politique," *Esprit* 111 (1 June 1945), 70-78, here 73-5. For more on the intellectual context of France between 1945 and 1947, see Edward Baring, "Humanist Pretensions: Catholics, Communists, and Sartre's Struggle for Existentialism in Post-War France" (2009). Mounier and *Esprit* were not at all doctrinaire supporters of the MRP, although Christian Democrats often cited him as an influence. Mounier is, in this period as always, politically amphibian, allying himself with various minor movements like *Jeune République* and the short-lived *Rassemblement Démocratique Révolutionnaire*. Michel Winock, *Esprit: Des intellecteuls dans la cité (1930-1950)* (1996). For Mounier's subterranean influence on Christian Democracy, see R. William Rauch, Jr. *Politics and Belief in Contemporary France* (The Hague, 1972).

of the Resistance. With Domenach at the lead, *Esprit* argued strenuously for economic nationalizations and for collaboration with Communism, a stance they would maintain even after *tripartisme* fell apart in 1947-8. "We are beginning to recognize," Mounier wrote in 1946, "that the necessity of economic planning [direction de l'économie] is not merely an invention of doctrinaires or partisans, but a profound requirement of modern economic structures."[24] Controversially, this pushed Mounier and his journal close to André Mandouze and his Union of Christian Progressivists: a group of Catholics with firm roots in the Resistance, dedicated to collaboration with Communists. In *Esprit*, Mounier wrote strongly in favor of Soviet policies, defending the show trials in a notorious 1948 editorial, for instance. Jean Lacroix had declared there in 1944 that "better than others, Communism saw the problem and approached its solution."[25] At this stage, they gave up on the MRP and held out hopes for a revived revolutionary Catholicism.

The other connection between the Resistance and the new Catholic left was *Témoignage Chrétien* (which celebrated and publicized Mounier's work at *Esprit*[26]). This had been a series of Catholic resistance tracts during the war; Gaston Fessard had written its opening number and had been closely involved with the group throughout the war. From 1944 onwards, the movement was reimagined as a newspaper of the same name. Although it never supported Communism as such, it did hold out the hope that collaboration with non-Christians in the name of a renewed France was possible, and even necessary. "We will know how to unite all of those who want to establish the rights of the human person," declared André Mandouze, the paper's editor in chief, in one of the

---

[24] [unsigned, presumably Mounier], "Libertés et dirigisme," *Esprit* 124 (July 1946), 128-9, here 128. *Esprit* commissioned Georges Gurvitch to write about nationalizations as well: Gurvitch, "La représentation ouvrière et le problème des nationalisations", *Esprit* 14, 1 (January 1946), 107-12.

[25] Jean Lacroix, "Dépassement du Communisme," *Esprit* 105 (December 1944), 56-64, here 59.

[26] See, for instance, André Mandouze, "Le christianisme a-t-il dévirilisé l'homme?", *Témoignage chrétien* 2, 45 (6 April 1945), 1.

paper's earliest issues.[27] In multiple essays throughout 1945-6, the paper allied itself with *tripartisme* and its nationalization policies.[28] The following year, in a special issue on "The Communists and Us," Jean Baboulène, a member of the editorial staff, put forth what he called a "catechism" of this relationship in an article titled, significantly, "La main tendue" (unlike in 1937, the title implies, the Catholics are extending a hand this time). The first article of the catechism: "We are Christians." The second: "We consider capitalism to be incompatible with our respect for man." The third: "We observe that the Communist party alone is capable of leading the struggle for the destruction of capitalism to the end."[29]

Those journals rooted in Father Bernadot's publishing empire, which were the nucleus of the civil-society Catholicism charted in Chapter 4, briefly evinced a form of left-Catholicism, too. In 1937, the hierarchy had pulled support from *Sept*, and it was relaunched as a lay periodical called *Temps présent*; under this name, it reappeared as a left-ist newspaper in 1944. Edited by Stanislas Fumet, a veteran from the 30s, it had a circulation of around 45,000.[30] An early article, entitled simply "The Church and the French Revolution of the Twentieth Century" and written in the journal's editorial voice, gives a flavor of its position: a new revolution is afoot, the author proclaims, and this time the Church is on its side.[31] "The problem," explained Jean Lacroix in its pages in January 1945, "is not, and must not be, to make France more more Communist or more Christian, etc.; it is […] to reconstruct a living nation in which Communists, Christians, and diverse spiritual

---

[27] André Mandouze, "Nous avons su rompre, nous saurons unir!" *Témoignage chrétien* 1, 15 (9 September 1944), 1.

[28] See, among others, André Mandouze, "Front spirituel," *Témoignage chrétien* 1, 23 (4 November 1944), 1; Anonymous, "Unité ouvrière? Oui!" *Témoignage chrétien* 2, 57 (29 June 1945), 1; J.-P. Dubois-Dumée, "Les Communistes et Nous," *Témoignage chrétien* 3, 89 (8 February 1946), 1.

[29] Jean Baboulène, "La main tendue," *Témoignage chrétien* 4, 154 (18 June 1947), 1, 3.

[30] For the circulation figure, see T.P., "A nos lecteurs," *Temps présent* 11, 139 (16 May 1947), 1.

[31] Verax, "L'Église et la Révolution française du Xxème Siècle," *Temps présent* 8, 9 (20 Oct 44), 7.

families can flourish."[32] That same year, the journal published an interview with Maurice Thorez, the head of the PCF. The opening matter emphasized Thorez's politeness, and the interview was clearly meant to make Communism seem less frightening to the journals' Catholic readership (especially in tandem with the articles praising the USSR that also occasionally appeared).[33] *La Vie Intellectuelle* appeared again, too; while it was more faithful to its civil-society leanings—going so far as to remove the social-political editorial from the journal's otherwise familiar format—it, too, shared in the left-Catholic effloresence. "The people of my country," Christianus enthused in the journal's first postwar article, "have rediscovered their original grandeur," and we must together seek a "true revolution."[34]

This position required a revision of totalitarianism theory, of course: the post-Nazi future could not possibly involve Communists if Communists and Nazis were to be equated. Pierre Emmanuel, in a 1946 editorial in *Temps Présent* entitled "The Interrupted Dialogue," attacked totalitarianism theory head on. "Many Christians," he lament, "reproach Communism for being totalitarian." This is absurd, as Communism is merely trying to spur social evolution, not to divide humanity into warring races.[35] Even *La Vie Intellectuelle*, which had been at the forefront of totalitarian theorization in the mid-1930s, got in on the act: "The Soviet phenomenon is great, and requires respect," an anonymous editorialist wrote in 1946. "It is naïve to put it on the same plane as

---

[32] Jean Lacroix, "Veut-on faire la révolution par une class ou par la nation entière?" *Temps présent* 9, 22 (19 January 1945), 6.

[33] Michel Hamelet, "M. Maurice Thorez nous précise la position du Parti Communiste," *Temps présent* 9, 24 (2 February 1945), 1.

[34] Christianus, [untitled editorial], *La Vie Intellectuelle* 13, 1 (February 1945), 1-16, here 2-3. A few months later, he defended his decision to cut the political editorials, arguing that the journal must hold itself above politics. Christianus, "Question de méthode," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 13, 6 (July 1945), 1-5.

[35] Pierre Emmanuel, "Le dialogue interrompu," *Temps Présent* 10, 120 (6 December 1946), 1, 5, here 5.

the Wagnerian décor of Hitlerism."[36] Joseph Rovan, a Catholic convert writing in *Esprit* in 1947, took this argument to its extreme, arguing that we should not be wary of totalitarianism, which he understood as a synonym of "centralization," at all: "if it is, according to our hopes, wishes, and actions, possible and necessary to refuse fascism, it cannot be a question of refusing every 'totalitarianism' […] unless we want to refuse history, unless we want to refuse the world."[37]

The political subject of left-Catholic utopia was not the nation-state, but Europe: "Resistance Europe" was not conceived of as a collection of separately socialist states, but as a revitalized and federalized continent. We might think of Spinelli's *Movimento Federalista Europeo*, founded in 1943 and doctrinally based on the "Ventotene Manifesto," written by Spinelli and circulated underground from 1941 onwards. In France, European federalism in the heady days of Liberation enjoyed the support of prominent resisters like Camus. The 1942 manifesto of *Libérer et Fédérer*, a resistance group centered in Toulouse, was published in *Combat, Libération (Sud),* and *Le Populaire*.[38] To give another example: *La Fédération*, the Vichy-based organization whose origins were discussed in the previous chapter, collaborated with socialists like Claude-Marcel Hytte, an ex-Communist who had been involved in the Resistance *Mouvement national révolutionnaire*.[39] The major institutional collaboration was the *Comité français pour la fédération européenne*, planned by resistance movements in 1944. Camus presided, while Catholics from *l'Aube* and *Témoignage chrétien* attended (the majority was socialist).[40]

---

[36] ---, "Antinomies soviétiques et conscience chrétienne," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 14, 4 (April 1946), 54-62, here 59.

[37] Joseph Rovan, "Fascisme, totalitarisme, racisme," *Esprit* 16, 12 (December 1947), 850-52, here 851.

[38] Bertrand Vayssière, *Vers une Europe fédérale?* (Brussels, 2006), 55n.

[39] Ibid., Part One, Chapter 2 for a general picture of Resistance federalism.

[40] Ibid., Part One, Chapter 3 on this.

Most of these movements were dedicated to Europe-wide federation, in which the East would be included.[41] Like many others, left-Catholics believed in a revitalized Europe that would save itself without falling prey to either the Americans or the Bolsheviks. Pierre-Henri Simon, an old hand from the early days of *Esprit*, wrote an article called "Is Europe possible?" in *Temps Présent* in 1947, arguing that Europe could survive only by threading the needle between captialism and communism, operating as a third force between the two behemoths.[42] The next year, when this form of European vision was quickly becoming outdated, *Témoignage chrétien* published a clarion call entitled "France and the Two Monsters"—a plea to save Europe from the excesses of both capitalism and Communism. They included a mock-identity card for France, listing the nation's profession as "expert in ministerial crisis", and its nationality this way: "would like to be neither American, nor Russian."[43] *La Vie Intellectuelle* followed suit; there, Maurice Schumann, an important member of the MRP, declared that a revitalized Europe must undergo an "intermediary revolution" between Bolshevism and American capitalism.[44] The Union of European Federalists, the largest federalist organization in Europe (and one founded by French Catholics), released a position paper in 1947 announcing the goal of "a unified Europe in a unified world." They were clear that Europe could ally with neither America nor Russia: the fomer was neo-imperial, while the second was totalitarian. One of its positions: "Refusal of a Europe delivered to the hegemony of any power whatsoever, but also a refusal of all anti-Communist crusades, whatever the pretexts."[45]

---

[41] Ibid. 140 *passim*.

[42] Pierre-Henri Simon, "L'Europe est-elle possible?" *Temps Présent* 11, 133 (4 April 1947), 3.

[43] "La France et les deux Monstres," *Témoignage chrétien* 5, 217 (3 Sept 48), 2-3.

[44] Maurice Schumann, "La France et le conflit planétaire," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 13, 1 (February 1945), 103-19.

[45] "Positions de l'Union Européene des fédéralistes," in Box UEF-91, Historical Archives of the European Union.

German Catholics, too, were enamored with the dream of a federalist, socialist-friendly, Resistance Europe. In fact, the early Christian Democratic Party was headed in this direction. The complex founding of the CDU/CSU cannot be adequately charted here, predicated as it was upon the various policies of the four occupying authorities and the fitful coalescence of regional parties. For our purposes, it is essential to note that, as in France, there were many left-Catholics in the 1944-7 period who saw the party as the basis for economic transformation and collaboration with socialists and Communists. German Catholic workers, enthusiastic supporters of the CDU from 1945 onwards, gave up their separate Christian trade unions and entered the SPD-leaning, but reliably anti-Communist, German Labor Federation [DGB] (a phenomenon which even Pius XII supported "as long as the extraordinary conditions of this age persist," as he wrote in an open letter to the German hierarchy).[46] As Noel Cary charts in his pioneering history of this period, the trade unionists at the heart of early CDU party formation desired a "Grand Coalition of Christian Democrats and Social Democrats.[47] Both the *Frankfurter Leitsätze* and the *Kölner Leitsätze*, two of the earliest programatic documents of the fledgling CDU, emphasized major land reform and the nationalization of coal, energy, and banking.[48] The highpoint of this form of CDU activism was the 1947 "Ahlen Program," which called for a robust program of economic nationalization. Karl Arnold, CDU kingpin and Minister-President of North-Rhine Westphalia, was promising that the CDU, aligned with the SPD, would go even further. Arnold's nemesis within the party, though, was the caucus chairman, Konrad Adenauer. He believed that the CDU's future lay, not in the coalition

---

[46] William Patch, "The Legend of Compulsory Unification: The Catholic Clergy and the Revival of Trade Unionism in West Germany after the Second World War," *Journal of Modern History* 79, 4 (December 2007), 848-80. Pius XII quoted on 849.

[47] Cary, *The Path to Christian Democracy,* 180, 185.

[48] Andreas Lienkamp, "Socialism out of Christian Responsibility: The German Experiment of Left Catholicism (1945-1949)," in *Left-Catholicism,*196-227, here 203-6.

of SPD and CDU that could be seen in Arnold's Düsseldorf, but in the coalition of the liberal FDP and CDU that was being charted in nearby Frankfurt.[49]

As Andreas Lienkamp has shown, the *Frankfurter Hefte* circle, and specifically Dirks himself, was a major force pushing the fledgling CDU leftward in the years before Adenauer and Erhard consolidated their control.[50] At its head were its co-founders and editors: Walter Dirks and Eugen Kogon. The presence of Kogon at the helm of a left-Catholic organ might seem surprising, given his history as an Austrian royalist and one-time supporter of National Socialism. The two had been briefly acquainted in the early 1930s, but they had not been comrades-in-arms: in one of the few surviving letters from this period, Kogon complains about Dirks's imprecise uses of the word "fascism" and emphasizes how very much he disagreed with Dirks's Marxist-inflected writings.[51] After 1945, though, the differences between them had somehow vanished: even the most left-leaning of the early CDU activists praised Kogon as a paragon of socialist intelligence.[52] The specifics of Kogon's trajectory will be dealt with in the next chapter: he became far more of a Cold War intellectual than Dirks ever did, and his true contribution is to Atlantic Catholicism, not its Resistance forebear. As we'll see below, the *Hefte*'s liberal critics pointed to Dirks, and not Kogon, as their *bête noir*.

In the beginning, the *Hefte* had the *Zeitgeist* on its side. "The CDU in its initial phases," Dirks later recalled, "was a 'left' movement […] [T]he conservatives were silent, as there was nothing to

---

[49] Cary, *The Path to Christian Democracy,* 191.

[50] Lienkamp, "Socialism out of Christian Responsibility: The German Experiment of Left Catholicism (1945-1949)." See Nachlaß Dirks, Box 355 for some of his early organizational activities in the party.

[51] Eugen Kogon to Walter Dirks, 24 December 1931, Nachlaß Dirks, Box 3.

[52] Peter Pfeiffer to Walter Dirks, 28 September 1947, Nachlaß Dirks, Box 18

conserve amidst the rubble and the wreckage."[53] Dirks was a close ally of Peter Pfeiffer, who was engaged in a campaign, via a never-ending series of *Rundschreiben,* to push the CDU to the left. They had each been quite hopeful about the party in the early days; the early programmatic statements of the CDU had been far more socialist than the party would eventually become. Although he refrained from much party-political agitation in the pages of his journal, Dirks's correspondence is replete with enthusiasim: in February 1946, for instance, he wrote to Pfeiffer in excitement over the CDU's recent electoral victories, even while admitting that "its inner character is not yet entirely stable."[54]

As with *Esprit* in France, Dirks and his journal were not acting alone. *Ende und Anfang* provided another left-Catholic vision for Europe's future, and it received support from both Dirks and Mounier. It was more opposed to the CDU than was the *Hefte,* and it wore its socialist stripes more proudly, publishing Theo Pirker and others from the left. It had a circulation of around 15,000 in the late 1940s, and was quite clear about its philo-Communism: "Communism," a 1947 editorial announced, "remains acceptable to the Christian conscience."[55] There was also *Werkhefte*, another Frankfurt-based journal, founded in 1947 and directly inspired by Dirks.[56] These were the major left-Catholic organs, but even those that would become more centrist were originally in line with the Christian Socialist vision: the newly-founded *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, along with *Die Besinnung*, for instance, published early articles in this vein.[57]

---

[53] Quoted (in German) in A. Bushell, "Prescribing for the New Germany: The Journal *Frankfurter Hefte* in its First Year of Publication (1946)," *German Life and Letters* (January 1988), 106-120, here 110.

[54] Walter Dirks to Peter Pfeiffer, 25 February 1946, Nachlaß Dirks, Box 10.

[55] Martin Stankowski, *Linkskatholizismus nach 1945* (Köln, 1974), 28, 49.

[56] Ibid. 138-55; Paul Waibel, *Politics of Accommodation* (Frankfurt, 1983), 67-70. This journal did not become overtly political until the early 1950s, but nonetheless had a left-Catholic orientation in the late 1940s, rooted as it was in the old *Rhein-Mainische Volkszeitung* circle (on which see chapter 3).

[57] On the postwar German periodical scene in general, see Doris von der Brelie-Lewien, *Katholische Zeitschriften in den Westzonen, 1945-9* (Frankfurt, 1986).

In a 1946 essay for *Frankfurter Hefte* called "Left and Right," Dirks made his case. There was no doubt that the CDU/CSU, a party of the rural and urban middle-class, would occupy the right-wing of Germany's revamped political spectrum: Dirks was not so naïve as to think that Bavarian peasants would suddenly welcome revolution and seek to resurrect the spirit of Eisner. The question, though, was the nature of that spectrum itself: "left" and "right," Dirks explained, were always relative. It used to be that "democracy" and "republic" were left-wing phenomena, but they now occupied the ideological center around which Germany's parties oriented themselves. His hope was that socialism would add its name to the roster of centrist political positions and "shed its 'left' character, just as democracy and the republic already have." Dirks believed Germany to be poised at the "the Rubicon that divides the bourgeois world from the socialism." Once the crossing was made, as Dirks was confident it would be, the question facing the CDU/CSU was this: would it be a party of the "normal right," meaning that it accepted the basic tenets of socialism, or would it become a truly *reactionary* party, seeking to restore a dead past? The party must, Dirks paradoxically instructed, "must decide in favor of the left in order to occupy a space on the right."[58]

In the next issue of the *Hefte*—which was, recall, a sensation at the time—Dirks completed his argument with an essay on "The Word 'Socialism'": the word that should now define Germany's political center and, more pointedly, a word that should replace the much-vaunted *Solidarismus* and *berufsständischen Ordnung* at the heart of Catholic social and political thought. Dirks defines socialism as a "*system* of cooperation [Genossenschaftlichen]," which must be distinguished from a merely "social politics" that does not attack the heart of the capitalist system. The problem with previous forms of Catholic social thought was that they were necessarily backwards-looking: they were based upon a Europe that had definitely gone. "The meaning and goal of socialism," Dirks instructs, "is

[58] Walter Dirks, "Rechts und links," *Frankfurter Hefte* 1, 6 (Sept 46), 24-36, here 24, 31, 32, 33.

the freedom and dignity of the person *under the conditions of an industrial economy based on the division of labor* [*arbeitsteiligen Großwirtschaft*]." This definition allows him to divide the political field into four options: there are those who simply "say no" to "the world of industry, the world of cities and mass men": they "aspire to go backwards" and "suspend themselves fundamentally in the world of the spirit." They may safely reject socialism, at the price of irrelevance. But he who utters a "'Yes' [to the world of industry] […] may choose between three solutions: he must decide between capitalist anarchy, fascist dictatorship, and the attempt to bring this reality of men into order, namely towards operation and justice: and this we call socialism." Socialism is thus distinguished from the bucolic pastures of *Solidarismus*, and from the twin menaces of capitalism and fascism. Thus far, almost everyone would agree with Dirks; he is consciously attempting to cast his net as widely as possible.[59]

But it was not that easy, and as Dirks drew in his net, it became clear that "the word 'socialism'" had specific referents that doubtless made many of his readers uncomfortable: specifically, those two policy positions that I've isolated as the central components of left-Catholicism: collaboration with Marxism and support of economic nationalization. Dirks's article was, of course, supportive of a certain form of socialism, but that word was being abused so often that he clarified the need, specifically, to collaborate with Marxists. Although the atheism of Bolshevism was of course to be rejected, its historical preconditions must be understood: the proletariat "found it difficult to understand themselves as children of God and as persons because they were not encountered as children of God or as persons, but rather in the pitiless mechanism of the labor market." Only by creating a more human economy could workers be won back for Christ. Dirks continues: "There is yet another reason, for which the Germans as passionate partymembers and Christians as satisfied believers have little sense: the political reason." "Socialism" has the

[59] Walter Dirks, "Das Wort Sozialismus," *Frankfurter Hefte* 1, 7 (Oct 46), 628-42, here 628, 631, 633 [emphasis in original].

potential to unite a coalition—"and indeed the right coalition"—that could lead Germany to a better future. Among its virtues: it fulfills to the 'left' the function of telling the Communists the conditions of their cooperation: this condition is socialism, whose essence excludes all totalitarianism." Here Dirks was in agreement with Kogon, his coeditor, in his belief that there was a kernel of Communism that could be saved from the pathology of totalitarianism: as Kogon wrote a few months later, Communists "are accused, after the collapse of fascism, that nothing essential differentiates them: dictatorship and totalitarianism, here and there. *That is not at all correct.*"[60] In geopolitical terms, too, Germany's precarious position in the mid-1940s would be endangered by lockstep anti-Communism: "The German Nation," Kogon explained in May 1946, "has nothing, absolutely nothing, to gain from a serious conflict between the Allies."[61]

Second, socialists must accept a planned economy: it is this "plan" that distinguishes socialists from capitalists (while the fact that the planning is "in the hands of those that live in and by it" distinguishes them from fascists). "In the center of the meaning of our historical moment from which we proceed stands the imagination of the 'planned economy [Gemein-Plan-Wirtschaft]'; we call it 'socialist' from grounds of verbal probity, because it contains an essential qualification common to all socialisms: the socialization of central means of production."[62] Dirks here gave voice to the cluster of Catholics his journal represented: "Christians in our time," declared a typical 1946 editorial, "are called to work towards the realization of the nearly century-old slonging of the worker's movement for a dignified economic order." The editorial went on to call for the nationalization of heavy industry and banking, as part of a general *Planwirtschaft* (ironically, and

[60] Eugen Kogon, "Über die Situation," *Frankfurter Hefte* 2, 1 (January 1947), 17-37, here 26.

[61] Quoted (in German) in A. Bushell, "Prescribing for the New Germany: The Journal *Frankfurter Hefte* in its First Year of Publication (1946)," 115.

[62] Walter Dirks, "Das Wort Sozialismus," 638, 641, 634, 642.

tellingly, the author of this article would go on to serve as the ambassador to the United States under Chancellor Ludwig Erhard in the 1960s: hardly a champion of the planned economy!).[63]

Dirks and his team were, like their French counterparts, inflamed by the dreams of a new European future (as in France, too, this was an axis of cooperation: Kurt Schumacher declared himself in favor of a "United States of Europe" in May 1946[64]). In the journal's very first article, an anonymous editorial, probably written by Kogon, on the Nuremberg trials, this emphasis was foreshadowed: "In Nuremberg (and certainly not there alone), the foundations for a world-state were laid."[65] In the same opening issue, Dirks declared "the end of the sovereign national state."[66] There were also, as there had been in German Catholic periodicals for decades, lengthy articles deconstructing the very concept of state sovereignty: Clemens Münster, one of Dirks's closest collaborators, contributed an early one called, simply, "The Dismantling of National Sovereignty." At this point, Münster did not imagine Western Europe allying with America against the East: he saw Germany's role as a "a mediation between East and West."[67] Kogon, in a 1947 article, declared that "the fate of the world" depends on "whether [Moscow and Washington] conflict with one another, or come to an agreement."[68] In a 1948 speech at an international congress, he clarified that Europe would be the scene of this *rapprochement*: "Our principal task," he announced, "consists in laying at least the foundations of economic and social relations in Western Europe, without breaking

---

[63] K.H. Knappstein, "Die Stunde der Sozialreform," *Frankfurter Hefte* 1, 3 (June 1946), 1-3.

[64] Vayssière, *Vers une Europe fédérale?* 130.

[65] [anonymous, probably Kogon], "Nürnberg und die Geschichte," *Frankfurter Hefte* 1, 1 (April 1946), 3-5, here 4.

[66] Dirks, "Die zweite republik," *Frankfurter Hefte* 1, 1 (April 1946), 12-24, here 16.

[67] Münster, "Abbau der nationalen Souveränität," *Frankfurter Hefte* 1, 5 (August 1946), 1-3, here 1, 2. For another example, see Bernhard Wegmann, "Die Souveränität der Staaten im Wandel von Politik und Wirtschaft," *Frankfurter Hefte* 3, 3 (March 1948), 228-37.

[68] Kogon, "Über die Situation," 24.

with the East and always keeping all of Europe in our vision." He called for "a third force" that could navigate "between Charybdus and Scylla."[69]

The interest in a revived Europe was buoyed by a continuation, and a significant expansion, of the transnational Catholic public sphere whose outlines were beginning to emerge in the 1930s. Mounier and Dirks worked together on several international conferences dedicated to forging a lasting, international Catholic leftism. "We found ourselves in the same boat," Kogon later wrote of Mounier's visit to the *Frankfurter Hefte* headquarters in 1946, "surrounded by the same dangers and gloom, with the same beliefs and hopes in our hearts, in agreement about our positions and our goals. […] We shook hands, as comrades."[70] In 1947, *Esprit* had a special issue marking the hundredth anniversary of the *Communist Manifesto*. Mounier wrote to Dirks asking for a contribution, emphasizing that the article "should neither be published under the auspices of a Marxist party, nor inspired by anti-Marxist prejudice." In Dirks's reply, and in the eventual article, he agreed: the essay "would be an attempt to relax the reciprocal misunderstandings" between Christians and Marxists, "an attempt to spur dialogue between the positions."[71] The following year, Mounier wrote again to invite Dirks to an *Esprit* conference, emphasizing that collaboration between *Esprit* and *Frankfurter Hefte* should increase and play an important role in the Europe *à venir*.[72] When Aloys Leber wanted to write an article for *Frankfurter Hefte* critiquing *Esprit*'s philo-Communism, which was always stronger than in its Rhenish counterpart, Dirks blocked it. "I hold this political engagement to be

---

[69] Kogon, "Les perspectives de paix en Europe," *Documents* 5 (1949), 56-72, here 62, 65, 67, 68. This originally delivered at Royaumont in October 1948.

[70] Kogon, *Dieses merkwürdige, wichtige Leben* 128-9.

[71] Emmanuel Mounier to Walter Dirks, undated [1947] (original in German), Walter Dirks to Emmanuel Mounier, 20 November 1947 (original in French), both in Nachlaß Dirks, Box 18. For the finished version, see Walter Dircks [sic], "Le marxisme dans une vision chrétienne," trans. Paul Thisse, *Esprit* 145 (May-June 1948), 783-98.

[72] Emmaunel Mounier to Walter Dirks, 7 April 1948, Nachlaß Dirks, Box 28.

one of the most essential and important elements of the *Esprit* movement and one of our most important tasks."[73]

Dirks and Mounier were staples of the multiple attempts at Franco-German Catholic rapprochement in the postwar years: they were each keenly interested in the affairs of their recent enemies, one writer going so far as to claim that Mounier "gave the impression, when he occupied himself with German affairs, that he lived only for them."[74] They were the two most famous figures to attend the *Deutsch-französische Schriftsteller Tagung*, held in Lahr in August 1947. They were joined by an honor roll of left-Catholics from both nations, representing the *Frankfurter Hefte* circle in Germany and the *Témoignage chrétien* and *Esprit* circles in France. In Mounier's opening address, he had proclaimed the need for a renewed Christian socialism as the antidote to an ailing Europe: a solution enthusiastically adopted, albeit with some reservations about method, by the hopeful congress.[75] A newspaper account claimed that the proceedings were dominated by dreams of a European "third force" that would mediate between, and learn from, both the USA and the USSR.[76]

The successor to the hopeful Lahr conference, held in October 1948 in Royaumont, evinced a rapidly-changing Catholic political culture.[77] The personnel was quite different: the leftists, including Mounier, Béguin, and Dirks, were joined by a clutch of liberals, notably F.A. Kramer, the editor of the liberal *Rheinischer Merkur* who would, a few months later, launch a broadside against the

---

[73] Walter Dirks to Aloys Leber, 2 June 1950, Nachlaß Dirks, Box 52.

[74] Anonymous, "Emmanuel Mounier" [obituary], *Allemagne: Bulletin d'Information du Comité français d'échanges avec l'Allemagne nouvelle* 6, 1 (April 1950), 1.

[75] Franz Schöningh, "Europas Strom—nicht Deutschlands Grenze," *Süddeutsche Zeitung* 3, 76 (6 Sept 47), 1-2. Schöningh, who will be discussed below, was present at the conference himself. Another account, portraying the congress as more divided than Schöningh, appeared in Pierre Lorson, "Rencontre d'ecrivains français et allemands: Lahr 25-9 août 1947," *Documents* 3, 8 (August 1947), 497-500

[76] Th. Ueberdick, "Begegnungen und Gespräche: Christliche Schriftsteller aus Deutschland und Frankreich trafen sich in Lahr." *Südwestdeutsche Volkszeitung*, 3 September 1947.

[77] A program can be found in Nachlaß Dirks, Box 361.

totalitarian leanings of the Dirks-Kreis. There were also joined by conservatives like Jean de Fabrègues, familiar to us from his para-fascist corporatism of the 1930s and his prominent support of Pétain. Dirks provocatively used the occastion to sound a warning that church's social conservatism was reasserting itself and betraying the hopes of the Resistance.[78] Dirks's closest collaborator, Eugen Kogon, was missing, and his keynote address was read by someone else.

Jean du Rivau, the conference's primary organizer, was horrified at Kogon's absence; he was, after all, enjoying massive fame at the time and it was a blow to the conference's legitimacy. Rivau claimed, in a groveling letter written a few months before the event, that the absence "would be a catastrophe." After giving some prosaic arguments—programs had already been printed, people were coming from as far as England to hear Kogon speak, and so on—Rivau revealed the symbolic trauma that would be wrought by Kogon's absence. Kogon had decided to travel to America instead of Royaumont. "In France," Rivau implored, "we will be astonished and […] offended if we have the impression that you prefer America."[79]

This was not merely a contingency of a busy man's schedule; indeed, Dirks too would be invited to America by OMGUS the next year, but would claim to be too busy.[80] Kogon's decision to go to America instead of Royaumont was emblematic of a paradigm shift that swept European Catholic intellectual life in the late 1940s: a shift that we can see as the reassertion of the anti-totalitarian personalism of the 1930s, and its reinterpretation as Cold War doctrine. As the Cold War heated up in 1947-8, the left-Catholic experiment collapsed across Europe and the more dominant anti-Bolshevik, anti-totalitarian, anti-étatiste politics whose development we've traced surged back

---

[78] Walter Dirks, "Aspects conservateurs et revolutionnaires de l'eglise en Allemagne," *Documents* 5 (1949), 48-55, esp. 53.

[79] Jean Rivau to Eugen Kogon, August 1948, Nachlaß Dirks, Box 31.

[80] See the report written by Urban Fleege (OMGUS) about a trip to Wiesbaden in January 1949. Religious Affairs Branch, 615 (A1), General Records, 1946-9, 390/46/15-16/5-4, National Archives, Box 159, Folder 13, page 2.

into a dominant position in the Catholic sphere. "Events," our old friend Christianus wrote laconically in the summer of 1947, "are accelerating."[81]

Gaston Fessard, Totalitarianism Theory, and the Collapse of Left-Catholicism

By 1948, the dewy eyes of the immediate postwar years had given way to the cold realism required by geopolitics. In a September 1947 letter to the former chancellor, Joseph Wirth, Dirks despaired that "things happen every day that make me want to tear at my hair."[82] In response to Pfeiffer's anguished suggestion that they leave the party altogether, Dirks replied that the whole issue was "so delicate and complicated that I am reluctant to discuss the matter in correspondence."[83] He was, at the time, writing letters to the socialist mayor of Frankfurt, attempting to organize "Zusammenarbeit" and apologizing profusely for the anti-socialist stance of local CDU officials. [84]The editor of *Etudes* voiced a newly majority opnion when he chided in 1949 that Catholics should have "better things to do than working towards the advent of a totalitarian, atheist collectivism."[85] In retrospect, the left-Catholic experiment seems to have been predestined for failure. As Martin Conway has pointed out, it remained primarily an urban, male, and elite phenomenon, never fully making a home in the rural or female constituencies critical to the success of Christian Democratic parties.[86] And the success that it had, Robert Paxton suggests, had more to do with the reassertion of traditional Catholic anti-capitalism than with a revolution in political consciousness.[87] At the level of

---

[81] Christianus, "D'abord, la verité", *La Vie Intellectuelle* 15, 6 (June 1947), 1-4, here 1.

[82] Walter Dirks to Joseph Wirth, 18 September 1947, Nachlaß Dirks, Box 22.

[83] Walter Dirks to Peter Pfeiffer, 10 April 1947, Nachlaß Dirks, Box 18.

[84] Walter Dirks to Walter Kolb, 3 January 1947, Nachlaß Dirks, Box 3.

[85] Quoted in letter from René d'Ounice to Marcel Moiroud, undated [February 1949], Fonds Fessard, Box 5, Folder 28.

[86] Martin Conway, "Left Catholicism in Europe in the 1940s: Elements of an Interpretation," in *Left Catholicism*, 269-81.

[87] Robert Paxton, *Vichy France* (New York, 1972), 348-9.

political culture, the acceptance of Marxism and economic nationalization—the two linchpins of left-Catholicism—flew in the face of every major trend in Catholic social thought as it had been percolating in the interwar period. But in the late 1940s, as the Cold War ramped up and the free-market-friendly U.S.A. began organizing a Western Europe in its own image, traditional Catholic political culture reasserted itself. "The European Resistance — I repeat: as a powerful and inflential political factor of determinate meaning — has become a historical memory," declared Eugen Kogon in 1949. "A mighty epic, subject-matter for poets and historians."[88]

This was not merely a matter of political culture, of course: these transitions were taking place against the backdrop of political changes, both international and domestic. Internationally, the Cold War was coming into being. By 1947, the division of Germany seemed final and the Truman Doctrine had been announced, while in 1948 the Prague coup and the Marshall Plan solidified the sense that Europe would, despite the wishes of the left-Catholics, divide into two. This had domestic repercussions, as well. In France, *tripartisme* collapsed and the customary political instability of the Third Republic reasserted itself in the Fourth. Although France's politics were tumultuous—far moreso than Germany's—it was at least clear that the dream of a new France, constructed out of the ruins of war and in the name of equality, was not in the cards; specifically, the near-complete electoral collapse of the MRP assured that a strident left-Catholic voice would be absent in French politics. So while one of the three parties of *tripartisme* was siphoning votes to de Gaulle's RPF, another one—the PCF—gave up on the United Front altogether, after determining that the SFIO and MRP were mere shills for American imperialism. Internationally, the idea that Communism might be turned in a Catholic-friendly direction became untenable: the most publicized evidence of this was the József Mindszenty affair, in which the Hungarian cardinal was imprisoned, tortured, and

[88] Eugen Kogon, "Der Politische Untergang des Europäischen Widerstandes," *Frankfurter Hefte* 4, 5 (May 1949), 405-12, here 407.

endured a show trial at the hands of the Communist regime. In this atmosphere a propaganda poster appeared on the walls of Paris, perfectly summing up the political exigencies of the moment (perhaps as only a parody can do): "God exists," the poster proclaimed. "Therefore, you may not be a Communist."[89]

In Germany, left-Catholic politics were dealt a blow at the same time. The Arnold/Dirks/Pfeiffer gambit to move the CDU leftwards manifestly failed, as Adenauer and Erhard cemented their control and began to theorize and construct a liberal Catholicism in line with the neoliberal insights charted in the previous chapter (Erhard was a friend and disciple of Röpke and Rüstow).[90] Even Jakob Kaiser, in September 1947, was criticizing the "totalitarian bent" of Schumacher's socialists.[91] That same year, the hierarchy began seriously discussing an end to the unified labor movement in Germany and the refoundation of Christian labor unions, as relations between Adenauer's newly-liberal CDU and the unified trade union movement itself [the DGB] had soured.[92]

Although the Church remained officially neutral in the Cold War, the Church's actions, most prominently its direct interventions in Italian electoral politics, were a spectacular instance of politics masquerading as non-politics. The Church made two major interventions in the late 1940s (this aside

---

[89] As reported in *La Vie Intellectuelle*, January 1949

[90] Dirks might have seen the writing on the wall: despite his own cautious philo-Communism, other CDU members had already been using anti-totalitarian rhetoric in 1946. Prof. Spira, "Zur Gestaltung des Verhältnisses von Staat und Kirche in Grosshessen," CDU party memo, April 1946. Nachlaß Dirks, Box 355. American influence may have been central here: Rudolf Uertz has theorized that their appointment of the conservative Jakob Husch to head the CDU in Hesse, instead of the Dirks-supported Karl-Heinrich Knappstein, played a major role in the CDU's liberal turn. Rudolf Uertz, *Christentum und Socialismus in der frühen CDU* (Stuttgart, 1981), 63n.

[91] Quoted on Cary, *The Path to Christian Democracy* 201. German Protestants were largely supportive of Adenauer and the CDU, although tensions remained. On this, see Benjamin Pearson, "The Pluralization of Protestant Politics: Public Responsibility, Rearmament, and Division at the 1950s *Kirchentage*," *Central European History* 43 (2010), 270-300.

[92] This became something of a fiasco; see William Patch, "The Legend of Compulsory Unification: The Catholic Clergy and the Revival of Trade Unionism in West Germany after the Second World War," *Journal of Modern History* 79, 4 (December 2007), 848-880, esp. 853-5.

from its obvious direct political roles, most prominently in Italian electoral politics). The first was a July 1946 letter from Pius XII to Charles Flory, the head of the *Semaines Sociales*. The pope begins with boilerplate Catholic remarks on the importance of natural law and the family as the fundaments of Christian community, before moving onto the political application: this analysis, he instructs, "applies to the particular case that interests you at the moment: the nationalization of industry." Although he does not issue a flat-out condemnation, he counsels extreme caution, suggesting that nationalization, far from "attenuating the mechanical character of life and work," "is in danger of increasing it." This is true "even when [the nationalization] is lawful [licite]." The "concentration of industry […] only plays in favor of capital and not of the social economy." This, in turn, flies in the face of the "Christian doctrine of the person" and tends towards "totalitarian pretentions."[93] According to a contemporary American observer, the letter "substantially toned down the enthusiasm of the French Catholics relating the program of nationalization."[94] "Although the Popular Republicans [MRP] were at one time almost as keen as the Socialists for nationalization," the *New York Times* reported a few months after Flory's letter, "they are now divided on this and many other issues."[95]

The intellectual response to the papal letter laid out the fault-lines for the battle to come. Left Catholics—notably Etienne Gilson writing in *Le Monde* and Jean-Pierre Dubois-Dumée in *Témoignage Chrétien*—attempted to salvage the MRP's policy, latching onto the Pope's marginal implication that there might be such a thing as a *licite* nationalization.[96] Dubois-Dumée accurately

---

[93] "Lettre de S.S. Pie XII à M. Charles Flory," *La communauté nationale*, *XXXIIIe session des Semaines sociales de France* (Lyon, 1947), 5-8, here 6, 7.

[94] Timasheff, "Nationalization in Europe and the Catholic Social Doctrine," 128.

[95] Kenneth Campbell, "French See Halt in Socialization," *New York Times* (18 November 1946), 8.

[96] See Gilson in *Le Monde*, 8 August 1946 and Fauvet, 17 September 1946.

characterized the intellectual nature of the pope's intervention, without admitting that it was destructive to the left-Catholic project he was supporting: "The principal theme of the letter is, one more time, the danger of totalitarianism, to which we must oppose a Christian conception of the human person."[97] Georges Bidault was more concerned: he wrote to Jacques Maritain, then serving as French ambassador to the Vatican, asking for more information on the Vatican's position. Maritain agitated to have a further explication published in *Osservatore Romano*, which appeared on 27 September. In his letter to Bidault, Maritain indicates the "official" quality of the new article, which perfectly encapsulates the civil-society Catholicism he had done so much to form in the 1930s. Like the pope's letter, the article reproduces by name the personalist anti-totalitarianism that had become the Church's official line, and which served to undermine the policy of nationalizations without directly saying so.[98]

While the letter to Flory was essentially ignored in Germany, the Vatican's next major intervention affected Catholic political culture across the continent: in the estimation of one Austrian Christian Democrat, it "had the effect, across the world, of a bomb."[99] In July 1949, the Holy Office published a decree in *La Documentation Catholique* forbidding Catholics "from registering in the Communist Party or from favoring it in any manner whatsoever."[100] The Church's opposition to Communism was no news, but the formal nature of the decree brought the Vatican suspiciously close to playing politics—to explicitly favoring one side over the other in the Cold War. This was

---

[97] Jean-Pierre Dubois-Dumée, "Les Nationalisations sont-elles condamnées?," *Témoignage Chrétien* 3, 116 (16 August 1946), 1-2. He was editor of the paper at this time.

[98] Jacques Maritain to Georges Bidault, 29 September 1946, Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim. The Bidault folder also includes a French translation of the *Osservatore Romano* article, which I've relied on here.

[99] F.R., "Das Anathem gegen den Kommunismus," *Österreichische Monatshefte* 4 (1948-9), 529-30, here 529.

[100] Quoted Pelletier, *Économie et Humanisme* (Paris, 1996), 252. For more on this, putting it in the context of the Vatican's other anti-Communist activities, see Dennis Dunn, "Stalinism and the Catholic Church during the Era of World War II," *Catholic Historical Review* 59 (1973), 404-28.

noted by Henri-Pierre Desroches, a member of the Economie et Humanisme circle and author of a controversial 1949 book about Marxism. "It is fully evident that the movement of the *Combattants de la paix* [a pacifist movement linked with the PCF] is a Soviet trump card in the Cold War," wrote one priest to his superiors in 1949. "But it is no less evident that the ecclesiastical ban on participating in such a movement will become an American trump card in the same war."[101]

Walter Dirks was probably correct in his estimation that the decree had been primarily aimed at French Catholics, notably Mounier and his circle of philo-Communists; as such, it had especially significant and interesting repercussions there.[102] A major player in this story is Gaston Fessard. Unlike many of his colleagues from the Resistance, he was never comfortable collaborating with Communists: he had been, as we've seen, an important peddler of totalitarianism theory in the late 1930s, and had stridently argued that Catholics should turn down Thorez's outsretched hand. After the Liberation, he looked on in horror as his fellow Catholics marched hand-in-hand with Communism, misunderstanding the anti-totalitarianism at the heart of Catholicism and the Resistance. As such, and in full awareness that the theory undercut the political experiments that his friends in the Resistance were supporting, Fessard returned to his totalitarianism thesis as soon as possible after the war. He resumed the theme as early as November 1944, three months after the Liberation (at an *Esprit* congress, no less).[103]

He was simultaneously composing his own major intervention into postwar politics: a book-length anti-Communist screed entitled *France, prends garde de perdre ta liberté!* (the title, riffing on his

---

[101] Henri Desroches, a member of the *Economie et Humanisme* circle, quoted on Pelletier, *Économie et Humanisme* 260.

[102] Walter Dirks, "Die Exkommunizierung der Kommunisten." This article found in Nachlaß Dirks, Box 355. I have been unable to find a published version.

[103] Gaston Fessard, "Politique et Economique," typescript of a lecture given at an *Esprit* conference on 22 November 1944, Fonds FEssard, Box 19, Folder 1. In the lecture he warns, characteristically, that Bolshevism and Nazism are totalitarian, both born from Hegel's master-slave dialectic and from the decomposition of liberalism.

most famous wartime tract, was an attempt to cash in on Fessard's Resistance credibility). The main purpose of the book, as Fessard told Jean Lacroix in 1945 and as is apparent from the book's contents, was to point out the manifold similarities between Nazism and Communism—a project designed to scuttle *tripartisme* in 1945 as much as it had the Popular Front in 1937.[104] As he revealed in a 1945 letter to the *Témoignage chrétien* editorial staff, it was Stanislas Fumet's dangerously Communist-leaning articles in *Temps présent* that had led Fessard to write the volume, against the warnings of Henri de Lubac, a close friend, that it would be employed by the right (which, of course, it was).[105] Fessard's colleagues at *Témoignage chrétien*, under whose auspices Fessard mischievously wanted to publish the volume, were equally aghast. André Mandouze, in his capacity as editor-in-chief, vetoed the book's publication, specifically objecting to the totalitarian theory animating the work.[106] Eventually, the book was, of course, published, and it provoked a firestorm of controversy. Fessard, perhaps seeking to draw his wayward flock into a public controversy, dedicated the second edition to his former Resistance comrades. In a shocked and private rejoinder, Mandouze and ten other members of the movement from its clandestine days rejected Fessard and his work.

> From 1941 to 1944, we worked, suffered, and fought side by side with you. That is why we separate ourselves with such great sadness. […] We refuse the assimilation of Nazism and Communism. We refuse to allow our Communist comrades, with whom we struggled as brothers for three years, to be insulted.[107]

---

[104] Gaston Fessard to Jean Lacroix, 2 December 1945, Fonds Fessard, Box 3, Folder 24.

[105] Gaston Fessard to the *Témoignage chrétien* editorial staff, 22 October 1945, Fonds Fessard, Box 3, Folder 24. For right-wing usage of Fessard, see Jean le Jamtel, "France, prends garde de perdre ta liberté!", *La France Catholique* 21, 4 (8 November 1946); Lantaigne, "Prends garde de perdre ta liberté," *Paroles françaises* 1 June 1946 (Lantaigne, writing in postwar France's most reactionary journal, is especially pleased about the Nazi-Communist equation). For praise of Fessard's anti-Communist work from former members of the *Action française*, see Louis Salleron to Fessard, 19 February 1949, and Henri Rambaud to Fessard, 15 February 1949, both in Fonds Fessard, Box 5, Folder 28.

[106] For the veto, see André Mandouze, "Note à l'usage de quelques pères sur la question Communiste." Not dated, but probably October 1945. Fonds Fessard, Box 3, Folder 24. For Mandouze's rejection of Fessard's totalitarian theory, see Fessard to Mandouze, 29 November 1945, Ibid.

[107] Joint letter (Mandouze et al.) to Fessard, undated but presumably 1946, when the second edition of Fessard's book appeared. Available in Fonds Fessard, Box 3, Folder 24.

But insulted they were, and the book was a major early blow in the reconsolidation of an anti-totalitarian, anti-Communist, paraliberal Catholicism in the late 1940s. One priest, perhaps overstating the case, was nonetheless onto something when he wrote in 1952 that Fessard's book had "violently ended the period of good relations between Catholics and Communists."[108]

Fessard was also, as we might expect, on the warpath against Emmanuel Mounier and *Esprit*. He engaged in a high-profile debate about Communism with Mounier at Cloître St-Séverin in April 1948. In Fessard's characteristically hard-charging lecture, he dissected the Mounier circle's misconceptions about Soviet Russia: their belief that it was not intrinsically atheist, that salvation lay with the proletariat, and, most importantly, that intrinsic differences between Nazism and Communism could be found. As he had done at greater length in his 1946 volume, he portrayed Communism and Nazism as both rooted in Hegel's dialectic of master and slave. Leo XIII and *Quadrgesimo Anno*, Fessard pointed out, had not condemned the *structure* of capitalism, but only its excesses. Bolshevism, as a form of "State capitalism [capitalisme de l'État]" is "certainly more capable of multiplying this excess than of healing it."[109]

The forces ranged against him at the time were substantial, both within and without the Church. Fessard referenced Merleau-Ponty's *Humanisme et Terreur*, if only to dismiss the argument that totalitarianism theory was in "bad faith."[110] Merleau-Ponty, along with future Communist giants like Louis Althusser and Catholic MRP stalwarts like Etienne Borne, was present at Fessard's

---

[108] Abbé J. Dussera, "Essai de bibliographie sur 'communistes et chrétiens", *Chronique sociale de France* 60, 4 (October 1952), 447-54, here 450.

[109] Gaston Fessard, *Le communisme va-t-il dans le sens de l'histoire* (Paris, 1949), 9-10.

[110] Ibid.

presentation and peppered him with questions, perhaps sensing that the Catholic retrenchment Fessard represented could only bode ill for the politics of Resistance Europe. Jean Hyppolite began the discussion by latching immediately onto the most troubling political axis of Fessard's talk: its totalitarianism theory. "M. Hyppolite," the *rapporteur* wrote, "expressed his agreement with the basic points of Father Fessard's lecture, *with the exception of the parallel he established between race and class*."[111] Hyppolite, along with Mounier and Fessard's other skeptical listeners, was convinced that Bolshevism, despite its flaws, remained a universalizing and emancipatory creed; the proletariat, as Hyppolite had pointed out, was supposed to disappear after the revolution and cease its dictatorship, while nothing of the sort was true of the Aryan race (Althusser characteristically dismissed the whole debate: "this little game," he sighed, "is of no essential interest").

Fessard had the wind at his back. By 1949-50, the much-vaunted Catholic left-wing scene had largely vanished. *Temps Présent* ceased publication in July 1948, but not before abandoning its Communist sympathies; in the last few months of its existence, the journal decried the "exploitation" of the Resistance by Thorez's PCF, coming out stridently in favor of de Gaulle and the RPF.[112] *Témoignage chrétien,* as we'll see in the next chaper, had given up its Communist sympathies and joined the emerging Atlantic consensus. *Esprit*, the third voice of Catholic leftism, was now a lone voice: in issue after issue, from 1947 onwards, *Esprit* bemoaned the end of the Resistance movement and the re-establishment of what Mounier had earlier called the "established disorder."[113]

---

[111] This report of the post-lecture discussion was not published, but is available in typescript in Fonds Fessard, Box 11.

[112] Jacques Destrée, "L'exploitation de la resistance par les Communistes", *À Présent* 1, 8 (9 April 48), 1; Gustave Gilbert, "Pourquoi de Gaulle?" *À Présent* 1, 11 (30 April 48), 1. The journal had changed its name to *À Présent* for the last few months of its run. In the opinion of one scholar, the journal collapsed because of doctrinal contradictions: the journal had tried to be Gaullist, Christian Democratic, and Christian progressive all at once. Yvon Tranvouez, "Un cryptocommunisme catholique? Les chrétiens progressistes en France, du début de la guerre froide à la mort de Staline (1947-1953), *Renseignement et propagande pendant la guerre froide (1947-1953)*, ed. J. Delmas et J. Kessler (Brussels, 1999), 227-42, 230.

[113] See, for instance, Paul Fraisse, "Après l'échec," *Esprit* 141 (January 1948), 1-13.

It refused to support the politics of blocs, and even after the birth of NATO, Mounier refused to take sides.[114]

Instead of following other French Catholics towards the Atlantic Consensus, Mounier and *Esprit* lent controversial support to left-Catholicism's last gasp: André Mandouze's *Union des chrétiens progressistes*, a small movement founded in 1947 and dedicated to building bridges between Catholicism and the Communist party. The union had been founded in February 1947 by Catholic sympathizers of Communism, dedicated to "a movement of opinion and propaganda connected to the PCF."[115] Fessard lambasted the movement in *Études*, with such vehemence that other Jesuits cautiously urged him to have more charity. Domenach wrote to say that the journal had been unfairly lumped with Mandouze's group, while Mounier himself leapt to the union's defense in *Esprit*, in addition to sending a long letter to *Études* about the issue.[116] The Union itself fought back in their house journal, *Positions*, claiming that Fessard's assault was no more than "an R.P.F. operation"; his theology was judged to be "too enmeshed in political, economic and social judgments to be truly classified as theology."[117] Whether or not this was true, he was not alone: in January 1949, the Italian version of the movement was condemned, while in February Cardinal Suhard, archbishop of Paris, criticized the movement, followed a few weeks later by the Bishop of Lille. The July 1949 excommunication, important as it was, was only a nail in the coffin.[118] "I suffer,"

---

[114] [unsigned, presumably Mounier], "Le Pacte Atlantique," *Esprit* 155 (May 1949), 577-90.

[115] Tranvouez, "Un cryptocommunisme catholique?" 228. See Thierry Keck, *Jeunesse de l'Église* (Paris, 2004), 275ff for a more detailed account.

[116] Jean-Marie Domenach to Gaston Fessard, 11 January 1949, Fonds Fessard, Box 5, Folder 28

[117] Maurice Caveing and Jean Verlhac, "Une Opération R.P.F.: l'Article du R.P. Fessard," *Positions* 3, 2 (March 1949), 3-4.

[118] Yvon Tranvouez, "Un cryptocommunisme catholique?" 231.

wrote the Dominican at the had of *Jeunesse de l'Église*, "at the decrepitude of a Christianity that is compromised with reaction."[119]

Fessard, who had been conversant with German Catholicism since studying with Peter Wust in the late 1920s, sought to extend his newfound influence there, sending all of his anti-Communist works to Walter Dirks in an attempt to sway Catholic Germany's most famous philo-Communist.[120] Dirks and many of his colleagues were as resistant to the anti-Communism of Fessard and the Vatican as the French were: one Austrian Catholic-Communist wrote that Catholics had received news of the 1949 decree "mit brennender Sorge."[121] Dirks, for his part, was furious about it: he was already spending his time in fruitless correspondence with priests upset that Dirks was abandoning Christianity in the name of godless socialism.[122] He penned a vicious article on the subject, entitled simply "The Excommunication of Communists," which was apparently left unpublished. The decree was, for the Catholic believer, "something distressing." Certainly, orthodox Communism was anti-Christian, but not all party-members are orthodox Communists. As he had been arguing for decades, Marxism has much to teach Catholics. In contemporary politics, the decree was harmful, too; in Hesse, for instance, a Communist party member, who happened to be Catholic, was running for

[119] Père Montuclard writing to Père Avril, 8 May 1950, quoted on Keck, *Jeunesse de l'Église* 297.

[120] Walter Dirks to Gaston Fessard, 10 November 1947, Fonds Fessard, Box 51, Folder D.

[121] This was the name of the papal encylcical directed against Nazism. Nikolaus Hovorka, "Die Religion ist in Gefahr! Ein gläibiger Katholik zum Exkommunkationsdekret." Undated sonderabdruck aus *Österreichisches Tagebuch*, available in Nachlaß Dirks, Box 355.

[122] See, for instance, the exchange between Kaplan Paul Wistuba and Walter Dirks in Nachlaß Dirks, Box 47 (Wistuba to Dirks, 23 June 1949, Dirks to Wistuba, 26 October 1949). The pope's more significant intervention in specifically German intellectual life was his announcement in June 1950 that economic co-determination could not be defended through natural law, and was in fact a danger to the more important law of private property. This contradicted the CDU's 1949 Bochum resolution, championed by Dirks. Lienkamp, "Socialism out of Christian Responsibility," 222-4.

office. This is just another instance, Dirks concluded, of Catholics allying with atheist capitalism instead of justice.[123]

Dirks had good reason to be concerned: in fact, the powerful *Rheinischer Merkur* published a series of editorials in October claiming that the *Frankfurter Hefte* should consider itself banned by the decree.[124] The *Merkur* was something of a mirror-image to *Frankfurter Hefte*: they were both Catholic periodicals of nationwide significance, centered in the Rhineland and stocked with figures from the Frankfurt-Bonn-Cologne circle traced in Chapter3.[125] The *Merkur*, like the *Hefte*, had a massive circulation: in this case, around 300,000. The two publications were probably the only two Catholic journals to be widely read across the Western zone of occupation.[126] They took, though, different paths as the CDU debated its future: the *Hefte*, as we've seen, remained firmly in favor of a socialist CDU, while F.A. Kramer and his *Merkur* were far more in line with the neoliberal synthesis, whose origins were traced in the previous chapter and whose political consequences were then becoming apparent in the Adenauer/Erhard administration.[127]

Given Dirks's antipathy to the CDU's liberal turn, a clash between the two journals was inevitable, and the papal excommunication of Communist party members and sympathizers provided the occasion. Kramer himself published an editorial referring to Dirks as the "intellectual

---

123 Walter Dirks, "Die Exkommunizierung der Kommunisten."

124 O.B. Roegele, "Um die Frankfurter Hefte." *Rheinischer Merkur* 41, 8 October 1949. This caused something of a controversy and numerous angry letters to Roegele. See Nachlaß Dirks, Box 364. It was perhaps this controversy that led Dirks to suppress the article he'd written criticizing the excommunication.

125 Kramer himself had published in Guardini's *Schildgenossen*, and his 1930s correspondence with Gurian indicates both that he was an avid reader of Gurians' works and that he saw Bonn as the center of *Abendland* (as a concept, not a journal). F.A. Kramer, "Der 'Pilger des Absoluten'", *Schildgenossen* 8, 3 (May-June 1928), 207-10. F.A. Kramer to Waldemar Gurian, 18 January and 8 February, 1930, Box 5, Folder, 20, Gurian Papers.

126 Gurian himself provides this circulation statistic, in "Re-educating Germany," *Commonweal* 48 (1948), 466-9, here 468.

127 For another interpretation of the newspaper as neoliberal, see Jean Solchany, *Comprendre le Nazisme dans l'Allemagne des années zero, 1945-1949* (1997), 116.

bridge-builder to the East."[128] This was followed by a prominent October editorial by Otto Roegele, one of the paper's editors, simply titled, "On the *Frankfurter Hefte*." " We are separated from Walter Dirks by serious political differences of opinion—political in the widest sense of the word." These differences, Roegele continued, "extend deeply into questions of philosophy and worldview." Dirks "overlooks" the fact that all parts of socialist doctrine are bound to one another and constitue a false, anti-Christian messianism. The paranoia of the burgeoning Cold War can be felt in Roegele's article: how, he asks, could Dirks agitate for socialism when there were Russian troops on our soil, engaging in a battle for the soul of Christendom? "It would be the same as if, before the third Crusade, with the West in great danger, someone in European Christendom had developed a program of 'Christian Islamism [Islamismus]." Such a hypothetical person, interesting as he might be, would rightly be condemned of heresy, as should the *Hefte*.[129]

The journal nonetheless continued to appear, as did *Esprit*. But, like Mounier, Dirks turned from crusading leader to lonely Cassandra. While journals in the mid-1940s had pushed for a true socialism, along with Dirks, these journals, along with the *Hefte* itself, turned towards the Atlantic consensus between 1947 and 1949 (as we'll see in the next chapter). The clearest analogue to the situation in France, though, was *Ende und Anfang*, which, as we saw above, housed a more vital confrontation between Catholicism and Communism than could be found in the *Hefte*. Like Dirks and Mounier, its writers were disappointed with the tack taken by Catholicism between 1945 and 1948: in an anonymous article on this topic, the journal pounced on the new trends represented by

---

[128] F.A. Kramer, "Ist der Rhenische Merkur nicht 'sozial…?" *Rheinischer Merkur* 4, 39 (24 Sept 49), 1-2.

[129] O.B. Roegele, "Um die Frankfurter Hefte." *Rheinischer Merkur* 41, 8 October 1949. This caused something of a controversy and numerous angry letters to Roegele. See Nachlaß Dirks, Box 364. "Roegele's influence on the Catholic media landscape and journalism of the early *Bundesrepublik*," one scholar has noted, "can hardly be overestimated." Klaus Große Kracht, "Von der ‚Rechristianisierung der Gesellschaft' zur ‚sauberen Bewältigung der Realität'. Wandlungen im Sendungsbewusstsein katholischer Intellektueller in der frühen Bundesrepublik 1945-1960," in *Die zweite Gründung der Bundesrepublik,* ed. Franz-Werner Kersting, Jürgen Reulecke und Hans-Ulrich Thamer (Stuttgart, 2010), 133-152, here 136.

Kramer and his *Merkur*. After praising the religious vitality and "Christian humanism" of the immediate postwar years, the author lamented the fact that all of these ideas—"*Abendland*, personality, dignity of the person, cultural values, freedom" and so on—became "slogans for Christian politics" and banners for a right-leaning CDU. The author saw this as a grievous misuse of ideas, turning Catholics against Communists instead of fomenting collaboration.[130] The American occupation, however, felt otherwise, and revoked the journal's license. Despite an outcry of support, from Mounier and Dirks, among others, the journal was outlawed by OMGUS in 1948 and folded in early 1949.[131]

While Catholics in general were enthused by Atlantic Catholicism's triumph, those few who had hitched themselves authentically to left-Catholicism were shattered, and it is worthwhile to dwell on their sad fate before moving onto the forms of Catholicism that would become historically central. Jean-Marie Domenach was scathing in his critique of Europe's new direction.

> Strange alliances are beginning to take shape between capitalists and revolutionaries, old Vichy-ites and resisters—unionists and federalists both: they have everything in common, they say, the same love of Europe. In reality, the first commonality is a hatred of Communism, which is an intellectual hatred of Marxism for some and a simple hatred of class for others: for anti-Communism is the only platform which permits the reunification of individuals so different and with nearly-opposite ideas.[132]

Dirks, too, who had been writing about federalism since his time at the *Rhein-Mainische Volkszeitung*, was skeptical of Europe's direction. European unity had to be predicated upon progressive domestic politics; otherwise, it was useless, doing no more than taking reactionary domestic politics "to the European level." Not every European unity movement, he came to realize, was a progressive one:

---

[130] Anonymous, "Der deutsche Katholizismus von 1945-48," *Ende und Anfang* 3, 3-4 (15 May 1948), 27-30.

[131] Sonderblatt, *Ende und Anfang* (10 August 1948), 1, 5.

[132] Jean-Marie Domenach, "Quelle Europe?" *Esprit* 150 (November 1948), 639-56, here 647

casting his eyes back to Metternich, Dirks opined that "for *this* Europe there is a precursor: the Holy Alliance."[133]

Dirks hurled these accusations in a widely-remarked 1950 essay that, more than any other, sums up the collective mood and failings of left-Catholicism. Its tenor is given away by its title: "The Restorative Character of the Age." "We are in the process," Dirks begins, "of losing our freedom. The peoples of Europe have not understood how to use either military failure or victory. They have not solved the problem that was set for them: to build a more human world after the ruin of the old." The continent had succumbed to what Dirks called the "spirit of strategy": a doomed effort to rebuild a bourgeois Europe in the hopes that its inner contradictions would not lead to the same calamity as its forebear, and in the fear that anything else would lead to Bolshevik revolution. This was not happening in either the USA or the USSR, which were boldly grasping their world-historical moments: "the field of restoration," Dirks admitted, "is Western Europe." There were, of course, many causes for this, including the KPD's bad faith and the meddling politics of the occupying powers. But one of the major causes was "the feeble Christians" and their rejection of a progressive politics. "The 'Frankfurter Leitsätze' and the 'Ahlen Program' make for bitter reading today."[134]

Although he made no public comment on the issue, Dirks was surely embittered by a scandal that rocked French Catholicism a few months later. In 1950, Etienne Gilson gave a series of lectures at the University of Notre Dame on the seemingly innocuous topic of Duns Scotus. In private conversations during his visit, Gilson repeated some of the talking points of left-Catholicism, as outlined above, while adding some colorful gossip. In Gilson's estimation, as he had been arguing for some time on the editorial pages of *Le Monde*, France should stay neutral between the USA and

---

[133] Walter Dirks, "Der Restaurative Charakter der Epoche," 952. For a more detailed dicussion of Europe by Dirks, from a similar perspective, see Walter Dirks, "Ein falsches Europa?" *Frankfurter Hefte* 3, 8 (August 1948), 698-710.

[134] Walter Dirks, "Der Restaurative Charakter der Epoche," 942, 943, 946, 948.

the USSR, as each power posed a menace of its own. Gilson did not count on the pugnacity of Waldemar Gurian, who was at Notre Dame at the time and was, as ever, prepared for controversy. Following Gilson's visit, Gurian published an open letter to Gilson in the pages of *Commonweal*, accusing him of "spreading the sad gospel of defeatism": "If, as a consequence of Soviet aggression, war breaks out between Moscow and Washington," he challenged, "there will be no neutrals."[135] By spreading clichéd anti-American propaganda, Gilson was undermining the mutual trust of Europe and America—the only relationship that could save Europe from Bolshevik domination. Despite Gurian's characteristic impropriety—an outraged Gilson charged that Gurian had never bothered to confront him personally before taking a public stand[136]—the newly-forming Cold War intelligentsia celebrated Gurian's missive accordingly. "Your letter," gushed Edward Shils, "was magnificent."[137]

The scandal soon extended far beyond the pages of *Commonweal*, following Gilson back home to France. Gilson was not a negligible figure there: as a professor at the Collège de France associated with the MRP, he had been one of the most strident voices of French Christian Democracy. He had not gone softly, however, into the dark night of left-Catholicism's irrelevance. He had been an outspoken opponent of NATO, for instance, and had already left the mainstream of Catholic opinion. Gurian's letter appeared in translation in *Le Figaro*, the conservative and pro-American Parisian newspaper (Gilson believed that François Mauriac was responsible[138]). This led to a flurry of articles that came to be known in the French press as *l'affaire Gilson*. One journal canvassed leading personalities for their opinion on the matter: Jean Paulhan, director of the *Nouvelle*

---

[135] Waldemar Gurian, "Europe and the United States: An Open Letter to Etienne Gilson," *Commonweal* 53 (1950), 250-1, here 250.

[136] Étienne Gilson to Waldemar Gurian, 2 October 1951, Gurian Papers Box 16, Folder 8.

[137] Edward Shils to Waldemar Gurian, 22 December 1950, Gurian Papers, Box 16, Folder 7.

[138] Or so Gurian reported to a Father Hessburgh, in a 1951 letter foud in Gurian Papers Box 16, Folder 8.

Revue Française, believed Gilson to be guilty of treason, while Marcel de Corte, a Belgian philosopher and former student of Gilson's, wrote in terms of stinging disappointment: "Gilson publicly abandoned all of those who valued him. Our affection trod upon, crushed, destroyed."[139]

This affair shows us, in clear relief, a series of important changes that had taken place by 1951. No prominent Catholics rushed to Gilson's side, although he did receive support (likely unwanted) from the Communist newspaper, *Action*. Gurian's letter, Gilson charged in his response to *Figaro*, "forms a part of a defamation campaign undertaken in a a happily restricted milieu, but virulent in the U.S.A., against every slightly well-known Catholic who does not take the war against Russia to be a sacred duty in the strictly religious sense of the term." He made a similar point in his letter to *Le Monde*: "The reason for this attack is a political fanaticism nourished by misplaced religious sentiments."[140] Gilson wrote these letters from Toronto, where he had taken up a professorship. The party he'd represented was in tatters, the newspaper he'd helped to found in the late 1930s (*Temps Présent*) had ceased publication, and his formerly mainstream political views had turned him into a radical. France in 1950 was no place for a neutralist Catholic. Atlantic Catholicism had by this point largely displaced Gilson's breed of left-Catholicism. Moreover, as this affair shows, Atlantic Catholicism was just as transnational as its predecessor: left-Catholicism would no longer dominate Catholicism *qua* transnational Catholic public sphere. Gilson was not brought down in an intra-French affair, but by a German exile writing in an American journal.

One of Gurian's charges was that Gilson had "emphatically accused a well-known and highly respected French publicist and scholar of being a paid American agent." As he revealed in a letter to the editor at *Commonweal*, the figure in question was Raymond Aron, whose *rapprochment* with

---

[139] *Centre d'Informations Catholiques pour la France et l'étranger*. Paris, le 24 Février 1951. *Fait de la Semaine*, no. 114. "Le Cas Gilson." Page 6. Gurian Papers, Box 16, Folder 10.

[140] For these letters, see Ibid., pages 8-10.

Gurian's brand of anti-totalitarian Catholicism was charted in the previous chapter.[141] In hindsight, though, we know that Gilson was, in a sense, correct about Aron: as a member of the Executive Committee of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, Aron was a beneficiary of the C.I.A.'s largesses (although this did not become clear for several decades). He was joined by our three major protagonists, all of whom worked with the CCF. Gurian published in *Der Monat*, the CCF's German organ, while Jacques Maritain was present at the CCF's opening meeting in Berlin and Eugen Kogon joined Aron on the CCF's International Executive Committee. Gilson thought that these figures needed to be bought off by the American government. About this, at least, he was wrong: there were deep-seated ideological reasons for the turn of our protagonists, along with Catholic political culture more broadly, towards Washington and a Cold War consensus. These rationale, and the transformation that led to Gilson's downfall, will be charted in the next and final chapter.

[141] Waldemar Gurian to Edward Skillin, 22 January 1951, Gurian Papers Box 16, Folder 8.

Chapter 8: "Occupying Religion": The Restorative Epoch and the Rise of Atlantic Catholicism, 1947-50

The French problem […] is to save a certain ideal of liberty and justice that symbolizes, for the masses, the word "democracy," while creating a political regime that is the very negation of democracy.
--Louis Salleron, 1938[1]

Actually, today the problem is not "Church and state," but Church and society.
--John Courtney Murray, 1949[2]

Introduction

In September 1948, an American priest named Father William McManus submitted a report to the Catholic Affairs Section of the Office of Military Government (OMGUS), which had been set up to govern the American zones of occupied Germany. As part of the massive de-Nazification and democratization efforts of the American military, he had been charged with examining religious education textbooks for potentially anti-democratic teachings. In his report, he praised the OMGUS relation to the churches, which he thought would be "one of the brightest pages in the history of the American occupation of Germany." He used a pregnant phrase to describe his understanding of the American mission: we are tasked, he declared, with "occupying religion."[3] This chapter is an attempt to understand the sense in which religion was "occupied" by America—or, more precisely, the ways in which American occupation interacted with the existing preoccupations of West European Catholicism. This occupation, like the Allied occupation of Germany more generally, was much more than a military occupation. Indeed, it comes closer to the secondary meaning of "occupation": engagement, in the sense that one "occupies" oneself with a task. American occupying forces and

[1] Louis Salleron, "Le problème français," *Combat*, October 1938 [not paginated].

[2] J.C. Murray, "Contemporary Orientations of Catholic Thought on Church and State in the Light of History," *Theologicial Studies* X, 2 (June 1949), 177-234, here 231.

[3] Report from Fr. McManus (U.S. Expert), "Religious Education in Germany," Records Relating to the Cultural Exchange Programs of the Catholic Affairs Section, 1946-1950, National Archives, 260/390/46/16-/4-, Box 200, Folder 16, pages 2-3.

American funds shaped Western Europe in many ways, but this was done with the cooperation of the Europeans themselves. As Geir Lundestad has suggested, the encounter was doubtless imperial, but it was an "Empire by Invitation."[4] And as McManus knew, the Catholic Church, as both hierarchical institution and wide-ranging political culture, was a privileged site for this peculiar form of empire.

The Vatican itself was keen to invite the American presence, obsessed as it was by Bolshevism. In 1947, Truman and Pius XII engaged in a published correspondence. While it was platitudinous and not overly political, its paeans to freedom and anti-totalitarianism had clear resonances (a companion volume of Pius-Stalin correspondence was not forthcoming).[5] On a more practical level, the Americans used the Vatican to funnel money to the Christian Democrats in the Italian election of 1948, which the Communists were in danger of winning. While Americans might be discomfited by religious parties, the political scientist Gabriel Almond wrote, we must support these movements as the ones that are closest in spirit to American humanism and American geopolitics.[6] The Church, he pointed out, had traveled a long way from the authoritarian, illiberal Church of the American imagination.

It had also traveled a long way from the warring clans of the 1930s: Catholicism in the late 1940s and 1950s displayed a single face and was not rocked by wars of manifestoes, or disputes between civil-society and corporatist Catholics. In the crucible of the Cold War, a new Atlantic Catholicism was born, under the aegis of the Americans and the burgeoning Cold War. Corporatist

---

[4] Geir Lundestad, "Empire by Invitation? The United States and Western Europe, 1945-1952," *Journal of Peace Research* 23, 3 (September 1986), 263-77.

[5] On this, see Diane Kirby, "Harry Truman's Religious Legacy: The Holy Alliance, Containment and the Cold War," in *Religion and the Cold War*, ed. Diane Kirby (New York, 2003), 77-102.

[6] Gabriel Almond, "The Christian Parties of Western Europe," *World Politics* 1, 1 (October 1948), 30-58. For more on Almond, see Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future*, esp. Chapter 4. Ironically enough, it was Almond himself who introduced the concept of "political culture" into political science: a concept that allows us to undercut Almond's own emphasis on Christian Democratic elites.

Catholics were forced to abandon the dream for an authoritarian, Catholic order—it was simply not in the cards, and anyway the weaknesses of that state form were painfully obvious. Civil-society Catholics, too, were largely forced to abandon their position of purity. Pius XII, for instance, wrestled Catholic Action firmly under clerical control, where it was used, in Italy as elsewhere, for largely conservative and political ends.[7]

There were, to repeat, two major ways in which Catholicism mattered at the time. First: it functioned as a discourse of legitimation.[8] This will be the main focus of this chapter: why, we will ask, did Catholics conceive of the new regimes as legitimate, when their democratic predecessors had not been? We tend to conceive of legitimacy as something owed to, or produced by, a political apparatus. But a consideration of Europe in the middle decades of the twentieth century challenges such an assumption. Regimes rapidly rose and fell, and yet Europe landed in exceptional stability. Even across the crisis years, there was substantial continuity at the level of economic structures and the civil service.[9] At the risk of stating the obvious: one fundamental reason that Europe was able, finally, to experience several decades of political stability was that most Western Europeans conceived of the new regimes as legitimate. This had less to do with the state as such than with the social-cultural-intellectual matrix from which the state emerged and in which it operated: in other words, political culture.

This bleeds into the second major way Catholicism mattered: as an actual strategy of governance, bolstered by electoral success and social-scientific management. Remember Part I of the

---

[7] Jean-Guy Vaillancourt, *Papal Power* (Berkeley, 1980), 50-60. Catholic Action in France too underwent a crisis during these years. Pierrard, *Laïcs dans l'Église de France*, 253-60.

[8] Martin Conway and Peter Romijn, "Political Legitimacy in Mid-Twentieth-Century Europe," in *The War on Legitimacy in Politics and Culture, 1936-1946*, ed. Martin Conway and Peter Romijn (New York, 2008), 1-27.

[9] See Mark Mazower, *Hitler's Empire* (New York, 2008), esp. Chapters 13 and 17. "The continuity of the state through the most violent ideological upheavals," he writes, "is one of the major unwritten themes of modern European history" (432).

dissertation – we cannot ask why Catholics supported or opposed democracy in the abstract, but only how it supported or opposed particular forms of democracy. The democracies of post-1945 Europe looked radically different from their predecessors in the 1920s. There were multiple reasons for this, of course. One of them was that Catholics themselves were often at the helm. More broadly, though, the new political and economic circumstances of post-1945 Western Europe were particularly congenial to social Catholicism's anti-étatiste bias. The Marshall Plan, the United Nations, NATO, the lengthy occupation of Germany, the Nuremberg Trials, and the list goes on: the state's monopoly was consistently threatened from above. From within, to take Germany as an example, the Constitutional Court was given wide scope to defend against violations of the Basic Law (this sort of constitutional, apolitical jurisprudence is familiar to us in America, but had been foreign to the German experience).[10] West Germany was deeply federal, enacting the de-Prussification that Catholics from Ketteler onwards had desired: the subnational *Länder* were granted authority over education, cultural affairs, radio, television, law enforcement, environment, and more. Many "public" functions were in fact carried out by "parapublic" institutions, which were really joint public-private ventures. The Churches were among the best examples of these, as they were granted enormous control over the delivery of social welfare in much of Germany; they were joined by a dense network of other institutions that made up what the political scientist Peter Katzenstein calls the "semisovereign state."[11] As Ketteler would have desired, much support was given to the family, as well: there was a Europe-wide resurgence of interest in the family as the proper locus of economic, moral, and political life. This had multiple dimensions, including natalist population campaigns and the status of the family as the privileged object of postwar welfare operations. All of this fed into a general European sense of moral retrenchment into the home, and a reimagination of

[10] Mueller, *Contesting Democracy*, Chapter 4.

[11] Peter J. Katzenstein, *Policy and Politics in West Germany* (Philadelphia, 1987).

the state as an agent that could provide housing instead of one that could violently reshape society.[12] For all of these reasons, Carl Schmitt, who was committed to a fundamentally Weberean notion of sovereignty, did not believe that the Bonn Republic was a state at all.

The age of economic monopoly was also over: the post-1945 period was one of decartelization and deconcentration on the American model.[13] NATO and the UN had their economic counterparts: GATT, the European Payments Union, the European Coal and Steel Commission, and more. The Constitutional Court had its analogue at the new Bundesbank; both were given significant powers and insulated from political pressures in ways their predecessors had not been. At the commanding heights of the state itself, organized labor and organized business cooperated in the "neocorporatist" manner familiar to us from the 1920s. Barry Eichengreen, in the best current economic history of post-1945 Europe, calls this a period of "Coordinated Capitalism," stressing the importance of corporatist institutions that were often rooted in the interwar years.[14] If anything, neocorporatism was even more advanced in the post-45 period: German labor unions organized themselves into one umbrella organization [the DGB], which coordinated industrial relations with a complex of employers' federations (their agreements were given legal standing). But this time, there was no longer raucous debate about this outcome, and Catholics did not feel that socialists were at the gate, foaming at the mouth to abolish private property and nationalize the economy. On the contrary, socialist parties jettisoned their Communist elements and signed onto the corporatist consensus.[15]

---

[12] On the family, see the special issue, "Domestic Dreamworlds: Notions of Home in Post-1945 Europe," *Journal of Contemporary History* 40, 2 (2005); for the family's resonance in America at the time, see Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound* (New York, 2008).

[13] Volker Berghan, *The Americanization of West German Industry, 1945-1973* (New York, 1986).

[14] Eichengreen, *European Economy Since 1945*.

[15] See Geoff Eley, *Forging Democracy* (New York, 2002), 311-16 for a general picture of socialist parties in Western Europe.

Moreover: while it is true, as Neil Brenner has demonstrated, that states were interested in incorporating their undeveloped regions into the new national space of the economy, it is *also* true that this "economy" was conceived of, across Europe, as a multifaceted phenomenon with complex vectors of authority and sovereignty, in which welfare was to be delivered as often by families and teachers and pastors as it was by the Leviathan of the state.[16] From the perspective of comparative political economy, Orfeo Fioreto has recently shown that European capitalism, from the 1950s onwards, was organized in a profoundly transnational way and cannot be analyzed in national terms.[17] The state was to coordinate and manage economic growth, but this always in alliance with subsidiary and super-state power brokers. The postwar drives for nationalization, for instance, were mostly abandoned for fear of Communism, and the post-war decades were triumphant for capitalism and open markets (the European Coal and Steel Commission was only the most visible success of the latter, which was a precondition for Marshall Aid). Now that "liberalism and capitalism have experienced their great transmutation," argued a prominent Rhenish-Catholic sociologist, Catholics could let down their guard and accept the new order. European economies began to enter, that is, the "neomedieval" space that some theorists have detected at the heart of modern capitalist organization. And who better than Catholics to lead this march back to the medieval?[18]

Catholics leapt at the opportunity, and they were at the commanding heights of post-1945 social and economic management. This is not a history of civil bureaucracies and policymaking, but it is crucial to keep this in mind. To take a few examples: Kees van Kersbergen has shown how

---

[16] For the best account of this "turn to the local" and its geopolitical contexts, see Martin Conway, "Democracy in Postwar Western Europe: The Triumph of a Political model," *European History Quarterly* 32 (2002), 59-84.

[17] Orfeo Fioreto, *Creative Reconstructions* (Ithaca, 2011).

[18] Goetz Briefs, "Katholiken und Marktwirtsschaft," *Die politische Meinung* 5 (1960), 32-41, here 32; the classic account of "neo-medievalism" is Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society*, third ed. (New York, 2002).

Catholic notions of the family infiltrated the new family welfare schemes. Philip Nord has shown how ideals of elite management nourished in Catholic Action movements were integral to social-security policy in Fourth Republic France Our old friend François Perroux, sent as an expert to study the Keynesean revolution in Britain, spearheaded the introduction of Keynesean economics into France; much of Monnet's team, meanwhile, came from Catholic Action movements.[19]

This is perhaps most obvious in Germany, as a number of scholars have shown.[20] Joseph Höffner is fascinating here. He was a priest and scholar deeply interested in social-economic questions. Before becoming Archbishop of Cologne, he founded the Institute for Christian Social Sciences in 1951, in Münster. He was probably the most prominent Catholic social scientist in Adenauer's Germany, as his Institute took over from the Königswinterer Kreis to become the clearing-house for Catholic social thought in a political era that was particularly congenial to it. In addition to organizing innumerable conferences and publications from his center in Münster, he held positions of political significance, most notably as spiritual adviser to the Union of Catholic Employers (founded March 1949). He was influential in the formulation of social policy, playing official advisory roles on topics as diverse as family, youth, employment, and housing issues, while Adenauer himself commissioned an influential report on social security policy from Höffner and three other economists.[21]

This is a story of unintended consequences, as is probably clear. When Höffner and the like agitated for an economy based upon family welfare and private property, they did not think that they were ushering in the new Europe of the 1950s, marked as it was by consumer culture, new gender

[19] Kees van Kersbergen, *Social Capitalism* (New York, 1995); Nord, *France's New Deal.*

[20] A.J. Nicholls, *Freedom with Responsibility* (Oxford, 1994); *Katholizismus, Wirtschaftsordnung und Sozialpolitik, 1945-1963*, ed. Albrecht Langner (Paderborn, 1980).

[21] Franz-Xaver Kaufmann, "Joseph Höfner als Sozialpolitiker," *Joseph Höffner (1906-1987)*, ed. Karl Gabriel and Herman-Josef Große Kracht (München, 2006), 37-50. On his relationship with Adenauer, see Hans Gunter Hockerts, *Sozialpolitische Entscheidungen im Nachkriegsdeutschland* (Stuttgart, 1980), 280-5.

relations, creeping secularization, and more. But create it they largely did. "The restoration does not know what it is doing," Walter Dirks sighed. "Collectively, it has a convoluted, and often false, consciousness, conjoined with a conscience that is usually good, even if misguided."[22]

Social Catholicism, that is, influenced the *actual shape* of the new European settlement. This chapter will be more interested, however, in the political culture of legitimacy, broadly speaking: the ways that Catholics outside of the immediate corridors of power understood the new regimes, and why they supported them. There were, I hope to show, three major components here: (1) on the international front, strong commitment to European federalism and currently-existing federalist movements (i.e. more than the traditional nostalgia for a decentralized Christendom); (2) on the domestic front, support of anti-totalitarianism and political pluralism (i.e. an emphasis on civil society as the bastion of political order, and the corollary that centralized state power is a great danger); (3) turn towards America, as both geopolitical force and as model for democratic, religious politics. The second of these needs some explanation: I'll be using "pluralism" to refer to the precise political theory at issue, and "anti-totalitarianism" for the shorthand that appeared more commonly in political discourse. As Nils Gilman has suggested, pluralism was "constructed as the opposite of totalitarianism."[23] I will refer to the three of these together as Atlantic Catholicism.

To reiterate: the claim here is not that these positions are *exhaustive* of Catholic political or social thought. I might have written about Christian humanism, which enjoyed widespread support, or Christian socialism, which proved quite divisive. The claim is that these are the terms in which the

[22] Walter Dirks, "Der restaurative Charakter der Epoche," 945.

[23] Nils Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future* 49. For the history of pluralism as political ideology, see Rupert Breitling, "The Concept of Pluralism," *Three Faces of Pluralism*, ed. Stanislaw Ehrlich and Graham Wootton (Westmead, England, 1980), 1-19. I am avoiding the Kallen-influenced debates over "cultural pluralism" in America. For more on this, and on American Catholic pluralism in this vein, see Philip Gleason, "Pluralism, Democracy, and Catholicism in the Era of World War II," *Review of Politics* 49, 2 (1987), 208-230.

newly-forged Catholic consensus was enacted.[24] These sections will also bring us up to date on the three major protagonists with which the dissertation began: Jacques Maritain, Eugen Kogon, and Waldemar Gurian. As we saw in previous chapters, they had begun in completely different circles, speaking different theological and political languages. Now, in the late 1940s, they were brought together by the new discourse of Atlantic Catholicism. Their paths intersect at only one point: a 1942 essay by Jacques Maritain, discussed in Chapter 6, on "The End of Machiavellianism." It was published in both Gurian's *Review of Politics* and Kogon's *Frankfurter Hefte*: it was also, not coincidentally, one of the earliest invocations of the Atlantic Catholicism on the horizon.

These three components extended far beyond Catholicism, of course. The other relevant groups—Americans, socialists, and liberals—were also on board, to varying degrees. In a way, what I'm tracing here is the Catholic contribution to the "end of ideology" that united non-Communist intellectuals across the public sphere of the early Cold War (the phrase was associated with the Congress for Cultural Freedom, welcomed by and welcoming to Catholic intellectuals). Daniel Bell provides a gloss of Atlantic Catholicism when he defines the end of ideology as entailing "the acceptance of a Welfare State; the desirability of decentralized power; a system of mixed economy and political pluralism."[25] The original thesis, as well as later discussions of it, have focused on ideology's collapse on the left. This is surely an incomplete interpretation: that complex of "post-ideological" social ideas was converged upon from both the left and the right, even though the "deradicalization" of the Right has received little scholarly attention. The analysis that Howard Brick applied to leftist intellectuals in America can be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to European Catholics: Daniel Bell's turn towards accommodation had little to do with his personal trajectory, and much to

[24] For just one example, we might look at a letter from Karl Thieme to Walter Dirks, following the latter's request for the former to write for *Frankfurter Hefte*. Thieme replied that he was of two minds: while he despised the journal's support of a "planned economy," he could heartily agree with their support of "German-European federalism." He then did, in fact, contribute. Undated [October 1946?], Thieme to Dirks, Nachlaß Thieme, Box 163, Folder 22.

[25] Daniel Bell quoted in Nils Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future*, 106.

do with "a particular expression of a general ideological current shaped by a confluence of historical forces reaching a special intensity at this time": economically, the surprising avoidance of postwar economic depression in both America and Europe; politically, the collapse of social democracy and the cluster of geopolitical events and crises that were eventually coded as "Cold War."[26]

While the American, socialist, and liberal consensus with Catholics on these values will be charted below, I should register here that all three of these groups had given up on their previous anti-Catholicism—a basic change in tenor that was a precondition for cooperation. Americans were welcoming Catholicism into their civil religion for the first time: Maritain and Gurian felt very much at home there, both personally and intellectually—Kogon, for his part, enjoyed his visits. While FDR had announced, only a few years earlier, that Catholics were in Protestant America "on sufferance," the early years of the Cold War were easier for American Catholics, as Truman and Eisenhower celebrated the rapprochement of Catholicism and American democracy (finally ratifying something that Tocqueville thought had happened a century previously). American Catholics were enthusiastic Cold Warriors, as well: the best example here is probably Edmund Walsh, a Jesuit who lectured at air force bases and the Army War College, while serving on Justice Jackson's Nuremberg staff and a presidential commission on the topic of universal military training.[27]

The Americans were not the Catholics' only partners on the continent: in some countries, notably Austria and the Netherlands, Catholics were actually in coalition with socialists, while elsewhere they at least were able to keep their disagreements within constitutional bounds. Schumacher's SPD, Mollet's SFIO, Schärf's Austrian SPÖ, and the socialist parties of other European countries largely abandoned the anti-clericalism that had structured their political

[26] Howard Brick, *Daniel Bell and the Decline of Intellectual Radicalism* (Madison, WI, 1986), 143.

[27] Inboden, *Religion and American Foreign Policy*, Chapter 3; Patrick McNamara, *A Catholic Cold War* (New York, 2006); Kevin Schultz, *Tri-Faith America* (New York, 2011).

argumentation in the interwar period. "It makes no difference," announced Kurt Schumacher, "whether one comes to Social Democracy by way of the methods of Marxist economic analysis […] or out of the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount."[28] In France, the presiding spirit of the SFIO, Léon Blum, sought to take the tired clerical/anti-clerical issue off the table, while even the strident Guy Mollet, by the 1950s, was collaborating with Catholics in the name of anti-Communism instead of attacking them in the name of *laïcité*.[29]

As we saw in Chapter 6, liberalism, too, had developed in a far less anti-clerical direction in the 1930s and through the war years. The two most prominent liberal intellectuals in Europe remained Raymond Aron and Wilhelm Röpke. Aron's star had risen in the Resistance, and he emerged as France's most prominent liberal intellectual and defender of the RPF. Röpke, as a close friend and inspiration of Ludwig Erhard, was one of the intellectual architects of the CDU's liberal policies, while he too rose to public prominence after the war. They were both notable Cold Warriors and retained their friendliness towards Christianity. "What are the philosophical bases of this elementary liberalism?" Aron asked a roomful of German students in 1948, referring to a liberalism that could adequately combat totalitarianism. "I see two of them: on the one hand, the Christian faith, and on the other a virile humanism."[30] He renewed his friendship with Gaston Fessard, perhaps France's most celebrated anti-totalitarian Catholic—by 1950, Aron could write to Fessard to say that they were engaged in the same task and confronting the same enemies.[31] Even

---

[28] Quoted in Waibel, *Politics of Accommodation* 24. This is not the place for a recapitulation of the complex relationship between the SPD and the Church over issues such as schooling; there were, doubtless, conflicts, and much of the SPD leadership remained anticlerical. Nonetheless, as Waibel points out, relations had doubtless improved since the Weimar period, and *on the ground*, at the local and state levels, cooperation was common (Waibel points in particular to Wilhelm Hoegner's tenure as minister-president of Bavaria).

[29] Richard Vinen, *Bourgeois Politics in France,* 141.

[30] Raymond Aron, "Discours à des étudiants allemands," 80.

[31] They became acquainted in the Kojève seminars, and had been corresponding in earnest since 1938. The letter in question here is Raymond Aron to Gaston Fessard, 15 January 1950, Fonds Fessard, Box 51, Folder A.

within the Catholic public sphere, Aron played an important role: he published in *La Vie Intellectuelle, Cahiers du Monde Nouveau*, and *La Fédération*—as we'll see, three of the central journals of postwar French Catholicism.

Röpke, too, maintained his stance as a Christian humanist; in *Die deutsche Frage* (1945), he recapitulated the familiar Catholic belief that the road to Hitler began with Luther, and he participates in the beloved Catholic pastime of demonizing Prussia, in particular, as Germany's "evil genius." A Catholic Germany, he theorizes, would never have succumbed to Hitler, and its only path to normalcy is a return to "the spirit of Christian and humanist principles."[32] He too was an important presence in the Catholic public sphere: like Aron, he also published in Cahiers du monde nouveau and La Fédération, while his work on Germany quickly appeared in translation with the Librairie de Médicis (on which see Chapter 6). Within Germany, he was a constant presence in the leading Catholic newspaper, *Rheinischer Merkur*, whose editor was a supporter of Röpke's views.[33]

Catholics returned the liberal embrace. Jean Daujat, a former disciple of Jacques Maritain who had been involved with General de Castelnau's *Fédération National Catholique* in the late 1930s, wrote an article in 1948 about the new crop of liberals. He praised particularly the anti-totalitarian liberalism of Hayek, Mises, and Röpke for surpassing their nineteenth century predecessors in their efforts against "the total regulation of life: in a word, the totalitarian State."[34] "I am neither Communist nor socialist, nor even for the New Deal," declared Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster, an influential German Catholic writer, in 1950. Instead, he was "entirely in favor of the capitalist system

---

[32] Wilhelm Röpke, *The German Question*, trans. E.W. Dickes (London, 1946), 138f, 144f, 118, 142.

[33] For F.A. Kramer on Röpke, see "Gegenwart oder Vergangenheit?" *Rheinischer Merkur* 2, 12 (12 April 1947); for one of Röpke's articles there, see Wilhelm Röpke, "Der Schlüssel zur Zukunft Europas," *Rheinischer Merkur* 3, 23 (5 June 1948), 1, 3.

[34] Jean Daujat, "Néolibéralisme et fédéralisme," *La Fédération* 38 (March 1948), 31. For more on Daujat, see Auzépy-Chavagnac, *Jean de Fabrègues et la Jeune Droite Catholique* 76, 117; for his involvement with the FNC, see Jean Daujat, "Les Missions de l'Action Catholique et les Unions paroissiales," *Credo* 150 (Oct 1938), 39-45.

of free enterprise. Not only because I am against Communism, but more because I am against the totalitarian system as practiced by the Russians."[35] The *Rheinische Merkur*, one of postwar Germany's most important newspapers, was essentially an organ of neoliberal Catholicism.[36] "*Liberalism*," Kramer proudly announced in 1947, "has not completely collapsed into the faceless rationalism of formal-democratic thought."[37] He referred specifically to "the powerful Renaissance of this school" in the work of Röpke and and Eucken, whom we met in the previous chapter. Röpke himself regularly published in the paper, which quickly became one of the lodestars of the CDU's political-moral firmament.In 1949, for instance, Joseph Höffner published an essay there called, simply, "Scholasticism and the Market Economy." He tried to show that, despite decades of interpretation to the contrary, canonical scholastics were wholly in favor of the market economy—they had, he claims, a "decisive objection to planned economies," by which they meant "total power of bureaucracy, dictatorship of the public authorities and the concomitant endangering of human freedom."[38] Even Gustav Gundlach was deeply optimistic, declaring that the ideal corporative order "is not only compatible with the 'social market economy', it is its logical refinement."[39]

The Catholic Public Sphere: An Overview

Before exploring the three facets of postwar Catholicism in detail, I want to show how hegemonic they, in fact, were, by providing an overview of the Catholic public sphere in France, Germany, and Austria overall. This might seem tedious, but it is necessary given the paucity of work on this subject. When we consider the Catholic public sphere as a whole, it is striking how closely it

[35] F.W. Foerster, "Mise au point," enclosed in a letter to Fessard, March-April 1950, Fonds Fessard, Box 51, Folder EF.

[36] Jean Solchany, *Comprendre le nazisme dans l'Allemagne dans des années zero 1945-1949*, 116.

[37] F.A. Kramer, "Gegenwart oder Vergangenheit?" *Rheinischer Merkur* 2, 12 (12 April 1947)

[38] Joseph Höffner, "Marktwirtschaft und Scholastik," *Rheinischer Merkur* 4, 18 (30 April 1949), 9.

[39] Quoted Albrecht Langner, "Wirtschaftliche Ordnungsvorstellungen im deutschen Katholizismus 1945-1963," in *Katholizismus, Wirtschaftsordnung und Sozialpolitik, 1945-1963,* 27-108, here 74.

hewed to the facets of Atlantic Catholicism outlined above. After decades of *Sturm und Drang*, Catholicism had settled into something approaching a consensus.

That said, the Catholic public sphere itself was splintered after World War II. "For years," Jean de Fabrègues complained to Maritain in 1952, "we have been *terrorized* by the absence in France of a center of intellectual Catholic influence."[40] There were a huge number of journals, each with its own idiosyncrasies and political bent. With the exception of *Esprit*, though, none of these journals charted an especially unique path. They were important because, as a whole, they created the Catholic political culture of legitimacy. Despite their disagreements, they were united behind Atlantic Catholicism and the legitimacy it granted to the emerging postwar order (even if certain features of it were harshly criticized). Rather than showing this to be true for every journal under discussion, which would be as exhausting to read as it was to write, I've split the publishing scene into four major groups: for both France and Germany/Austria, those journals rooted in the civil-society Catholicism of the 1930s (Chapter 4), and those rooted in the corporatism of the same period (Chapter 5). Although these distinctions had, in a real sense, ceased to matter, these constellations of journals retained differences of emphasis and continuities in personnel with their interwar forebears. For each of these four groups, I'll choose one journal as an exemplar to discuss in more detail.

The major French civil-society journals of the interwar period had been *La Vie Intellectuelle* and *Sept*. *La Vie Intellectuelle* survived and prospered after the war, while the fate of *Sept*, which was renamed *Temps Présent*, has already been considered in Chapter 7 (it had been resurrected as a left-wing newspaper, and it collapsed along with the rest of the left-Catholic public sphere). After the war, *La Vie Intellectuelle* was joined on the progressive wing of French Catholicism by *Cahiers du Monde Nouveau*, a relatively highbrow journal put out by *Témoignage chrétien*, as well as the *Témoignage chrétien* newspaper itself. Each of these was, by 1948, firmly in the Atlantic Catholic camp. In a way,

[40] Jean de Fabrègues to Jacques Maritain, 20 August 1952, Archives Maritain, Kolbsheim.

this is not surprising: the major tenet of civil-society Catholicism was that political and religious authority could separate, so long as each respected its proper sphere (thus entailing an implicit political philosophy). The Fourth Republic saw very little overt anti-clericalism, while it was the Communistic opponents who were charged with integrating religion and authority. For these reasons, *La Vie Intellectuelle* could support the Atlantic Consensus almost without question. More interestingly, these journals provided a landing-ground for disappointed left-Catholics. To see how this happened, let's look at *Témoignage chrétien* [TC].

In the previous chapter, *TC* appeared as one of the central loci of Resistance Catholicism: indeed, as late as 1947, its authors were pointing to Communism as the only path to a brighter future, claiming as a corollary that Europe could not afford to align with America. Over the next two years, the paper radically changed. In 1948, articles began to appear about atrocities in the Soviet Union, and the Catholics at *TC* were as appalled as those elsewhere by the Cardinal Mindszenty affair.[41] The newspaper also adopted the three basic conceptual schemes of Atlantic Catholicism. First, federalism: the journal had very little about federalism between 1944 and 1946, but it began to appear with greater frequency in 1947, as Atlantic Catholicism was consolidating itself. Alexandre Marc and Jean Bareth, a correspondent for *La Fédération*, penned a series of articles in the winter of 1946-7 introducing the paper's readers to federalist theory, while Pierre Locardel, a few months later, trumpeted the Marshall Plan as a harbinger of European federalism. By 1949, the paper could include an article from leading federalist Hendrik Brugmans on the theme, while the paper's companion journal, *Cahiers du Monde Nouveau*, defined itself almost exclusively as a federalist organ.[42]

---

[41] J.-P. Dubois-Dumée, "L'Arrestation du Cardinal Mindszenty, ou l'art d'utiliser la politique contre l'Eglise," *Témoignage chrétien* 5, 234 (31 December 1948), 1, 6; --, "L'Eglise tchécoslovaque sous le bäillon 'Savoir Lutter contre la Religion,'" *Témoignage chrétien* 5, 262 (15 July 1949), 2.

[42] Pierre Locardel, "Le Plan Marshall sauvera-t-il l'Europe?" *Témoignage chrétien* 4, 156 (27 June 1947), 1-2; Hendrik Brugmans, "L'Europe: terre des hommes libres," *Témoignage chrétien* 5, 267 (19 August 1949), 1, 6; Pierre Chaillet, "A Nos lecteurs," *Cahiers du Monde Nouveau* 5, 1 (January 1949), 1-3.

Second, anti-totalitarian pluralism: this represented a shift, as the newspaper had, like other left-Catholic organs, earlier agitated against totalitarianism theory. In 1945, for instance, an editorial declared that Catholics must collaborate with Communists, in pursuit of wide-ranging economic nationalization, and that this would not lead to "totalitarianism.[43] Within a few years, though, the paper's editors had turned strongly against Communism, arguing for the totalitarian nature of the regime in Russia and, through publication of an article by David Rousset in 1949, the Communist regime's similarity to the Nazi one.[44] This led the paper to the third, and defining, characteristic of Atlantic Catholicism: support of America in the Cold War, and the renunciation of the dream of a Third Force Europe. In March 1949, Jean Baboulène, one of TC's main editors, penned a *mea culpa* entitled "America Has the Ideas and the Ideas that are Working." In the wake of the Mindszenty scandal, the crackdowns in Eastern Europe, the PCF's change in tactics, and the success of the Marshall Plan, it had become clear that Catholics must give up on Communism in the name of America.[45] In May, the paper published an interview with Maritain, in which the sage of Meudon extolled the moral virtues of the American mission. By the time of the Vatican's anti-Communist decree in July, the paper had already abandoned the Communist sympathies that had, in part, summoned the decree in the first place: the paper accepted it as a *fait accompli*, pointing out in its coverage that the moral failings of Communism had long been apparent.[46]

Témoignage chrétien, with its origins in the Resistance, found itself agreeing with its former enemies by 1948: journals stocked with Vichy collaborators became Atlantic Catholics, too. The 1930s corporatists, despite their tarnished histories under Vichy, quickly reconsolidated their

[43] --, "Unité ouvrière? Oui!", *Témoignage chrétien* 2, 57 (29 June 45), 1.

[44] Pierre Chaillet, "La Tragédie de l'Eglise Russe," *Témoignage chrétien* 3, 106 (7 June 1946), 1.

[45] Jean Baboulène, "L'Amérique a des idées et des idées qui réussissent," *Témoignage chrétien* 5, 244 (11 March 1949), 1, 6.

[46] Robert Barrat, "Une interview de Jacques Maritain," *Témoignage chrétien* 5, 253 (13 May 1949), 1, 6; Louis Bernaert, "Le décret du Saint-Office: un acte avant tout religieux," *Témoignage chrétien* 5, 263 (22 July 1949), 1.

personnel and their ideas in two major journals: *La France Catholique* and *La Fédération*. The former was the biweekly organ of the *Fédération national catholique*, the integralist movement founded by General Castelnau that had proven so attractive to corporatist Catholic intellectuals in the 1930s (in 1945, it was rechristened *Fédération national d'action catholique* [FNAC]). The editor-in-chief was none other than Jean de Fabrègues, one of Pétain's leading intellectual henchmen. The journal's history mirrored that of Catholic political culture more broadly: with an initial circulation of 10,000, it initially trailed far behind the left-Catholic *Temps Présent* (which it resembled in format). But history was, finally, on Fabrègues's side: while the left-Catholic journal sputtered and disappeared, *La France Catholique* exploded in popularity, reaching a circulation of 55,000 within fifteen years.[47] The journal's more intellectual sister, with whom it shared essentially all of its writers, was *La Fédération*, which was even more rooted in Vichy. While *La France Catholique* was a new journal that happened to have many collaborationists in its midst, *La Fédération* was, as an institution, a direct survival from the National Revolution (see Chapter 6). And even more than its FNAC cousin, it was the premier landing-place for former Catholic corporatists and Vichyites: most prominently, Jean Daujat, Jean de Fabrègues, François Gravier, François Perroux, and Louis Salleron. Intriguingly, these two journals toed the Atlantic party line even more enthusiastically than did their more progressive counterparts.

The federalism of *La Fédération* goes without saying: federalism was its whole mission, inscribed in the journal's title and in nearly every article therein (the exact shape of this federalism will be considered below). Second, anti-totalitarian pluralism: in 1945-6, several articles were published that not only worried about Nazi-Bolshevik totalitarianism, but sounded the alarm that Fourth Republic France was headed down the same path: "France," wrote a correspondent in spring

[47] For these numbers, see Véronique Auzépy-Chavagnac, *Jean de Fabrègues: Persistance et originalité d'une tradition catholique de droite pendant l'entre-deux-guerres* (Doctoral thesis, Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris, 1993), 508.

1946, "is about to become totalitarian."[48] While they occasionally held out the hope that collaboration with socialists might be acceptable, Bolshevism *qua* totalitarianism was always beyond the pale.[49] Unsurprisingly, this was translated into swift opposition to nationalizations: they came out against the nationalization of Renault, for instance, in 1945.[50] Lastly, and in a spectacular way, support for America. Max Richard, one of the journal's editors and an old hand from the 1920s *Action française* and the 1930s *Jeune Droite*, made this clear for the first time in December 1947, in an article called simply "Cold War." Against those who dreamt that European federalism could take the form of a "Third Force" between the battling blocs, Richard asserted that the Cold War, which is "already hot," forces us to choose sides, and between the Marshall Plan and Soviet takeover, we must choose the former.[51] The following year, Jean Lorraine wrote an article about the American election of 1948. "America," Lorraine chided, "is not merely the nation of great banks and industries. It is also, and perhaps above all, a nation that believes firmly in its ideals." We must "remember that the great choice of our times is, doubtless, between the spirit of Lincoln and that of Lenin."[52] Finally, in a capstone to this phenomenon, the May 1949 issue featured a special section, called "America and Europe," dedicated to Franco-American understanding. The American

[48] Jean Bareth, "La Suisse sera-t-elle totalitaire?" *Circulaire intérieure de La Fédération*, May 1946, 10-12, here 10 (he added, implausibly enough, that Switzerland was not far behind). See also, A. Gautier-Walter, "Contre l'Etat partian et totalitaire. Pour l'Etat national et fédéral," *Circulaire intérieure de La Fédération* (April 1946), 9-10; [Anon], "Tentation du fascisme," *Circulaire intérieure de La Fédération* (November 1946), 1-3.

[49] Lucien Laurat, "Matérialisme philosophique et matérialisme historique," *La Fédération* 25 (February 1947), 19-20.

[50] [Anon], "Points de vue," *Circulaire intérieure de La Fédération* (May 1945), 19; see also Camille Blanchard, "Le syndicalisme, les grèves et les nationalisations," *La Fédération* 46 (November 1948), 24-5.

[51] Max Richard, "Guerre Froide," *La Fédération* 35 (December 1947), 23.

[52] Jean Lorraine, "États-Unis 1948," *La Fédération* 38 (March 1948), 6-9, here 9.

ambassador to France, Jefferson Caffery, contributed an article, as did Paul Devinat, secretary to the Prime Minister.[53]

The German periodical scene was as devoted to Atlantic Catholicism as its French counterpart, if not moreso: while French Catholics were somewhat hamstrung by their lack of an effective political movement after the collapse of the MRP, Germans could line up behind the Atlantic Catholicism of Konrad Adenauer, whose politics fit precisely into the tripartite schema I've described. As with France, we will begin with an analysis of the surviving civil-society periodicals before moving onto the residues of the corporatist scene.

The German civil-society tradition, nourished in the Weimar Rhineland, had been largely decimated by a dozen years of repression, and the fact that it had always been a minority current did not aid in its survival. The major journals in which it continued to appear were *Frankfurter Hefte, Hochland,* and *Rheinischer Merkur*. Each of these journals was stocked with figures from the interwar period who had, along with Gurian, argued for the impossibility of a return to a medieval order, and the possibility of economic and moral justice in an industrial society. Each of these journals, like its civil-society counterparts in France, emerged as members of the Atlantic Consensus. The most surprising example here is probably *Frankfurter Hefte*, which was described in the previous chapter as a leading journal of philo-Communist left-Catholicism.

The closest student of German left-Catholicism, in his consideration of the *Hefte* between 1948 and 1950, concludes that "there is absolutely no doubt" that the journal supported the "Western orientation of Germany."[54] Despite the controversy with the *Merkur* described in the previous chapter, and despite Dirks's lamentations over the restorative character of the age, the

[53] Jefferson Caffery, "Les Etats-Unis devant le fédéralisme européen", *La Fédération* 52 (May 1949), 273-7; Paul Devinat, "Deux mondes solidaires," *La Fédération* 52 (May 1949), 278-9.

[54] Stankowski, *Linkskatholizismus nach 1945,* 112.

journal used the vocabulary, and participated in the discourse, that was ratifying that lamentable restoration. It did not, that is to say, adopt the position of outrage adopted by *Esprit*. "We know E. Mounier and we understand very well the analogies and common points that bring us together," Kogon told an interviewer in 1947. "But the structure of our reviews is different."[55]

The journal, unlike its French counterpart, was among the most vociferous supporters of European federalism, largely thanks to the editorship of Kogon, who, as we will see below, became one of Europe's most prominent federalist intellectuals and leaders. It also shared the language of anti-totalitarian pluralism, although it was more marked in Kogon and other contributors than in the writings of Dirks himself, attuned as he was to the conservative uses to which these concepts could be put. As we saw in the last section, Kogon was keen to point out during the efflorescence of left-Catholicism that it was illegitimate to equate Bolshevism and Fascism as forms of totalitarianism. But by 1948, he was freely referring to Communism as inherently totalitarian: in November of that year, he published an article, henceforth added to new editions of *Der SS-Staat*, making this case at length.[56] He was not alone: in a December 1947 article, Karl Buchheim, after defining Catholic political philosophy as dedicated towards freedom, concluded that a "total state cannot bear such a freedom; the freedom of the Church is therefore especially abhorrent to it."[57]

Lastly, the turn to America: the journal was always friendly to American influence, at least partially because the Americans were in control of their license and precious paper supply. One particular OMGUS lieutenant, a friend wrote to Gurian, was "tremendously enthusiastic about the

[55] A. Wiss-Verdier, "Conversations avec E. Kogon," *Documents* 3, 8 (August 1947), 563-5, here 565.

[56] Eugen Kogon, "Der Terror als Herrschaftssystem," *Frankfurter Hefte* 3, 11 (November 1948), 985-1000.

[57] Kogon, "Über die Situation," 27; Karl Buchheim, "Grundlagen und Anfänge des politischen Katholizismus," *Frankfurter Hefte* 2, 12 (December 1947), 1224-35, here 1225.

Kogon-Dirks group; he furthers them wherever he can."[58] Kogon himself praised the Marshall Plan, in January 1948, as far superior to anything on offer from the Soviets. "In its scope," Kogon writes, "the Marshall Plan draws the conclusions from the failures of the first post-war period [i.e. the post-1919 years] and points towards Europe's future."[59] In the opening editorial of the same issue, Kogon argued that Europe must cast its lot with the United States. The dreams of Europe as a "third force" were over, while the Communists seemed intent on making the same mistakes as they had in 1932: total opposition to democratic republics. While the United States was imperfect, it was at least trying to create European organizations and develop the continent towards freedom and away from totalitarianism.[60]

As in France, the corporatist, authoritarian-leaning Catholic intellectuals of the mid-1930s retained their prominence into the late 1940s. The central locus of the Catholic corporatist tradition, as we saw in Chapter 5, was Austria, and particularly the circle around Dietrich von Hildebrand and *Christliche Ständestaat*. And just as figures from Vichy's cultural apparatus populated, and even dominated, postwar French Catholic intellectual production, figures from the Dollfuss regime held important positions in postwar Germany and Austria. The Hildebrand-Kreis, in particular, provided the editorial staff for some of postwar Mitteleuropa's most important Catholic periodicals. The most significant of these was *Neues Abendland*, which I will discuss in detail below. It was edited by Emil Franzel, a Bohemian Catholic who had been a member of Hildebrand's circle in the 1930s and seems, interestingly enough, to have been the middleman between Kogon and Hildebrand.[61] The

---

[58] Goetz Briefs to Waledmar Gurian, n.d. [1946?], Gurian Papers, Box 1, Folder 28. Klaus Dohrn, previously editor of *Christiche Ständestaat*, told Emil Franzel that Kogon's tactic was to convince the Americans that he and his journal represented the right wing of German Catholicism! Franzel, *Gegen den Wind der Zeit* 435.

[59] Eugen Kogon, "Das Jahr der Entscheidungen," *Frankfurter Hefte* 3, 1 (January 1948), 16-27, here 24.

[60] Eugen Kogon, "Der Kampf um Europa," *Frankfurter Hefte* 3, 1 (January 1948), 1-3.

[61] For Franzel's discussion of his work with Hildebrand, see Emil Franzel, *Gegen den Wind der Zeit*, 304-8.

role of *La Fédération* was filled in Germany by *Föderalistische Hefte*; just as the former was stocked with figures from Vichy, the latter was replete with figures from corporatist Austria. It was edited by Walter Ferber, who had been, like Franzel, a member of Hildebrand's circle in 1930s Vienna. He had written for both *Christliche Ständestaat* and *Die Neue Zeitung*, a newspaper briefly edited by Kogon.[62] A similar intellectual profile was apparent in Austria itself, Hildebrand's home turf: *Österreichische Monatshefte*, the house organ of Austria's ruling and Christian Democratic Austrian People's Party [ÖVP], became an enthusiastic exponent of Cold War Catholicism. The journal was edited by Alfred Missong, who had, like Kogon, followed a trajectory from Eberle's journals to *Christliche Ständestaat*, where he was a frequent contributor.

Neues Abendland, which the State Department reported as having a circulation of around 25,000, was the most successful and influential of the newly-founded German Catholic periodicals.[63] Despite the name, there was no institutional link between it and the Rhenish *Abendland*, discussed in Chapter 3; *Neues Abendland* was headquartered in Bavaria and drew its vocabulary and personnel more directly from the corporatist tradition outlined in Chapter 2. This is most apparent in its editor, Emil Franzel (who took over the reins from Johann Naumann in 1947 and, as Vanessa Conze has rightly judged, oversaw a rightward turn in the journal[64]). Franzel and his contributors were surprisingly brazen in drawing the parallels, especially at a time when few Germans were willing to call themselves conservative: in one 1947 editorial, for instance, Franzel actually called for a revived "Ständestaat": the Austrians, he now claimed, had gotten it wrong and not uprooted liberal

[62] Seefried, *Reich und Stände* 204. The journal shared a great deal of personnel and ideology with *Neues Abendland*: Franzel wrote for the *Hefte*, too, as did Hans Pfeiffer and Georg Laforet.

[63] "Report from Richard Reid (U.S. Expert)." Records Relating to the Cultural Exchange Programs of the Catholic Affairs Section [OMGUS], 1946-1950, National Archives, 260/390/46/16-/4-, folder 19.

[64] Conze, *Das Europa der Deutschen* 128.

capitalism violently enough.[65] He was joined by Franz Klein and Walter Ferber, both contributors to *Christliche Ständestaat* (the former writing under the pseudonym Robert Ingrim), alongside Hans Rost, one of the major figures at *Allgemeine Rundschau*.[66] They also featured figures from the earlier Eberle-Kreis, such as Hermann Bahr, while Eberle's postwar works themselves received positive reviews.

Rooted so squarely in the authoritarian corporatist tradition of *Mitteleuropa*, it is fascinating to see how closely the journal hewed to Atlantic Catholicism. Federalism was one of its major reasons for being, both as an institutional and intellectual movement. Especially in the 1950s, the journal was the central node of a constellation of federalist organizations like Abendländische Aktion, Abendländische Akademie, and the Centre Européen de Documentation et Information (organizations which counted CSU/CDU politicians, not merely intellectuals, among their ranks).[67] This should be no surprise: certain forms of federalism had been prominent in these circles for decades, as we saw in Chapter 2, but, in the new context of the late 1940s, it took on a new cast given the unlikelihood of Habsburg restoration. Its contributors were highly aware of this tradition, publishing appreciations of Weimar federalist Catholics like Schmittmann and Foerster. "We old federalists," sighed Hans Pfeiffer in 1946, "who were already fighting for true federalism in the time of the Weimar Republic, are gratified to examine today the progress towards a federalist construction."[68] The journal praised, for instance, the Union of European Federalists—one of the major federalist organizations, headed in Germany by Eugen Kogon and founded in the circle around *La Fédération*—and even quoted Jean Baboulène (from *Témoignage chrétien*) on the necessity of

[65] F. [probably Franzel], "Der 'Ständestaat,'" *Neues Abendland* 1, 12 (Feb 47), 22-4.

[66] See Conze, *Das Europe der Deutschen* 103 for this attribution

[67] Ibid. 11.

[68] Hans Pfeiffer, "Föderalistische Betrachtungen," *Neues Abendland* 1, 7 (Sept 1946), 19-22, here 19.

a new Europe.[69] This was linked with the same fear of the nation-state, and particularly of Prussia, that had animated earlier generations of federalists. They squarely imagined themselves in that tradition, as they had in the 1920s, writing about the "federalist subsidiarity principle" in Bishop von Ketteler's social though and, in highly familiar terms, lauding federalism as

> a hierarchical system of social self-government, founded on the person[, whose] object is not only the true state, but the universal social arrangement, formed by the subsidiarity principle, which elevates itself from the person, over the family and the neighborly […] and professional […] social circles up to the federal [bündische] state and the community of states.[70]

Given the journal's *mitteleuropäische* roots, it is no surprise that this federalist commitment was the flip side of a thoroughgoing anti-totalitarianism. In the 1947 editorial already quoted, Franzel parroted the Hildebrand line by arguing that only the corporative state provided "a path towards the overcoming of totalitarianism."[71] Walter Ferber, in a 1946 piece on the "essence of federalism," claimed the same.[72] Georg Laforet, in an essay from the same year called "The Limits of State Power," which admirably sums up the journal's political stance, emphasized five times the "totality" of the Nazi state on the first page, wielding the word like a talisman.[73]

More surprisingly, though, and contrary to the way that the journal has been portrayed in the literature, it was generally pro-American in its outlook. Of course, like all other Catholic journals, it maintained the same allergy to materialism, consumerism, and so on, but America in the public sphere meant much more than that in the late 1940s. The first move in the slow reorientation of conservative Catholics towards America appeared in a 1946 article about the American social thinker

---

[69] Anonymous, "Europäischer Föderalismus," *Neues Abendland* 2, 3 (June 47), 118.

[70] Anonymous, "Kettelers Staatslehre," *Neues Abendland* 1, 5 (July 1946), 27-9, here 27; Walter Ferber, "Paul Jostock," *Neues Abendland* 1, 7 (Sept 46), 23-6, here 23.

[71] F. [probably Franzel], "Der 'Ständestaat,'" *Neues Abendland* 1, 12 (Feb 47), 22-4, here 23.

[72] Walter Ferber, "Das Wesen des Föderalismsus," *Neues Abendland* 1, 4 (1946-7), 4-7.

[73] Laforet, "Die Grenzen der Staatsgewalt," *Neues Abendland* 1, 9 (Nov 46), 8-11.

Henry George, who was presented as a paragon of orthodox, personalist Catholic social teaching.[74] A few months later, a short article appeared about "federalism in the United States," quoting with excitement from an article Harold Dodds, president of Princeton, had written about federalism in the *New York Times Magazine*; the writer went on to add that American federalism had much in common with Catholic social teaching.[75] Hans Pfeiffer, quoted above on Weimar federalism, agreed: "In England and the USA," Pfeiffer explained, comparing them positively to German traditions, "personal freedom and corporative freedom, and self-government of communities and freedom of instruction, are self-evident, integrated elements of political life as a whole."[76]

One further German journal, Eberhard Welty's *Die Neue Ordnung*, does not fit into this schema, representing it does a mix of civil-society and corporatist Catholicism (just as Welty's sociological works of the 1930s had been one of the few to incorporate Maritain and Hildebrand). For that reason, though, it might be considered as especially typical: it fell into the orbit of Atlantic Catholicism along with the others. In his discussion of the journal, Damian van Melis, one of the best scholars of postwar German Catholicism, confesses puzzlement. He claims to see a looming contradiction at the heart of Welty's project, which was both opposed to modernity and capitalism, while supporting Adenauer's American-oriented politics: "politics and ideology," he concludes, "did not come together."[77] I will argue that, in fact, they *did* come together, in a precise and interesting way. Welty's anti-modernism set him up squarely to become a mouthpiece for Adenauer, and for Atlantic Catholicism more broadly. To see how this was so, in greater detail, I will further investigate

---

[74] Nikolaus Ehlen, "Der Boden als Gemeineigentum," *Neues Abendland* 1, 9 (Nov 1946), 24-8.

[75] G.L. "Der Föderalismus in den Vereinigten Staaten," *Neues Abendland* 1, 12 (Feb 47), 21-2.

[76] Pfeiffer, "Föderalistische Betrachtungen," 21.

[77] Damian van Melis, "Europapolitik oder Abendlandideologie? Die Dominikanerzeitschrift Neue Ordnung in den ersten jahrzehnten der BRD," in *Katholiken und Protestanten in den Aufbaujahren der Bundesrepublik*, ed. Thomas Sauer (Stuttgart, 2000), 170-86, here 179.

each of the three pillars of Atlantic Catholicism, taking as our guides the three exemplary figures whose careers we've been tracing since Part I: Eugen Kogon (federalism), Jacques Maritain (anti-totalitarian pluralism), and Waldemar Gurian (support for America).

Atlantic Catholicism (I): Eugen Kogon and European Federalism

In Daniel Bell's estimation, one facet of the non-ideological ideology of postwar life was "decentralized power"; in European terms, this translated into *federalism*, which burst onto the scene in an amazing way from 1944 onwards. Catholic clearly played a major role here, insofar as the founding fathers of European institutions—Adenauer, Gasperi, Schuman—were believing Catholics who played up the *abendländisch* nature of their political activities. As with other aspects of the story, the federalism of these Catholic political elites has been described before. And, as elsewhere, that story is both important and incomplete: Catholic federalism did not matter merely because of the (really quite minor) achievements of European federalism in the late 1940s. From a historian's point of view, Catholic federalism was not about federalism at all: it was about legitimacy. There were few concrete successes, and it would be a stretch to say that Catholic forms of federalism affected political life overmuch (except insofar as the groundswell to be charted here may have pushed politicians to support the ECSC). But what federalism did do was convince Catholics that the liberal democratic states of postwar Europe were legitimate: their stated openness to federalism, and their submission to the ECSC, NATO, the Marshall Plan, and so on, demonstrated that the states had given up on the maniacal drive for totalitarian sovereignty that, as Catholics had been arguing for decades, constituted the very essence of the modern project and its intrinsic violence.

The single most remarkable fact about postwar Catholic intellectual life, I submit, was the hegemony of federalism as the optic through which to view the European past, present, and future. It was ubiquitous in every Catholic journal I've seen: the three most important Catholic newspapers—*Rheinischer Merkur, Süddeutsche Zeitung, Témoignage chrétien*—were obsessed with federalist

language, too.[78] The past, the argument ran, had been catastrophic because of the overweening and godless *Machtstaat*, the present was shot through with virtuous federalist tendencies, and the future presented the intoxicating image of a Europe free from the menace of nation-state sovereignty. Much of this rhetoric is familiar to us from past chapters: it sounds much like the Action française critique of the centralized French state, for instance, or the various Bavarian and Rhenish critiques of Prussian centralism. But now this language had a new valence. It was now employed in the service of the legitimacy of the postwar order, which had not been the case in the interwar period. In the last chapter, we saw that federalists in the early postwar years, 1944-7, were dedicated to a Resistance, Third-Force Europe that would fundamentally restructure the political and economic order of Europe as a whole, refusing to choose between the USA and the USSR. By the late 1940s, though, there were only two viable options for organizing international relations: European federalism, under the wing of the Americans, or a Communist Europe, ruled from Moscow. Following the 1947 formation of the Cominform, and the Marshall Plan, Third Force Europe left the realm of possibility. Molotov made it perfectly clear that federalism, even in the limited form desired by the French government, was unacceptable to the Soviets, so any political federalism was necessarily antagonistic to newly-rigid Communist parties.[79] Meanwhile, French politicians were forced to accede to America's mandate that Western Germany regain its sovereignty and be integrated into a free-trade union: the hope, shared by Morgenthau and French diplomats, that

[78] See, for instance, F.A. Kramer, "Gegenwart oder Vergangenheit?" *Rheinischer Merkur* 2, 12 (12 April 1947), 1; for *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, which as a journal explicitl dedicated to Catholic/socialist cooperation, is an interesting newspaper in this regard, see these articles in its two inaugural issues: "Zum Geleit", *Süddeutsche Zeitung* 1, 1 (6 October 1945); "Neugliederung des Reiches: Vereinigte Staaten von Deutschland?" *Süddeutsche Zeitung* 1, 2 (9 October 1945).

[79] Irwin Wall, *The United States and the Making of Postwar France, 1945-1954* (New York, 1991), 66. Bidault, who saw the political writing on the wall, reported to the American ambassador as early as 1946 that he "no longer believed that France can be an intermediary between the USA and the USSR." Quoted Ibid. 59.

Germany might be pulverized into political fragments was laid to rest by geopolitical necessity.[80] The fear of state sovereignty that used to determine Catholic opposition to liberal democracy was transposed into anti-Communism. "The civilization that claims to impose Communism," it was announced at a major federalist congress in 1950, "is based […] on the exclusive importance of the collective and its final expression: the STATE."[81]

Federalism was a particularly congenial conduit for formal royalists to join the Atlantic consensus. Joseph Baumgartner, a prominent Bavarian politician and one of the founders of the CSU, illustrates the continuities well: in the 1920s, he had been involved with the BVP—the conservative, quasi-monarchist wing of the *Zentrum*—before becoming a Christian democrat and crusading federalist after the war. Baumgartner also, incidentally, provides an example of the transnational nature of Atlantic Catholicism: in addition to his work at *Föderalistische Hefte*, he wrote for both *La Vie Intellectuelle* and *La Fédération*. We could also look at André Voisin, who began his career as a minor member of the *Action française* in the 1930s before entering the history books after 1945 as one of the founders and early leaders of the Union of European Federalists. Gonzague de Reynold, an earlier admirer of Maurras, Mussolini, and (especially) Salazar, admitted in 1953 that "in order to be strong, or even to be at all, any European union would need to rely on America."[82] Jean de Fabrègues provides another instance of the continuities between 1920s royalism and 1940s federalism: in a 1948 article, after describing his traditional idea of Catholicism as the dissolution of

[80] Alan Milward, *The Reconstruction of Western Europe* (London, 1984), Chapter 4; John Gillingham, "From Morgenthau Plan to Schuman Plan: America and the Organization of Europe," in *American Policy and the Reconstruction of West Germany, 1945-1955*, ed. Hartmut Lehmann (Cambridge, England, 1993), 111-34. By 1948, the National Assembly could declare support, by 419 votes to 183, of "integration of a federated Germany into a European Union" (significantly, the Communists were the holdouts). *Documents on the History of European Integration*, Vol. 3, ed. Walter Lipgens and Wilfried Loth, trans. Paul Falla (New York, 1988), 21.

[81] "Le Problème de la défense européenne." Delivered at UEF Strasbourg congress, 17-19 November 1950, Historical Archives of the European Union, UEF-101.

[82] Quoted in Bernhard Salzmann, *Europa als Thema katholischer Eliten* (Fribourg, 2006), 189. This book, which is about European ideologies in Catholic Switzerland, offers a more detailed, geographically limited version of the analysis I offer here.

sovereignty into multiple centers, he concludes that "[i]t is possible to bestow the name 'federalism' on this notion of life."[83] Fabrègues is saying here that he can reiterate the same social philosophy he has espoused since his time as Charles Maurras's secretary, but that *now* it is possible to call it "federalism," and *now* we do not need a revolution to get it: major organizations, dedicated to the legitimacy of the postwar order, were acting in its service.

Catholics widely believed that the long-desired dissolution of state sovereignty was forthcoming in Atlantic Europe. Whereas the interwar period had been dominated by statist retrenchment—even the League of Nations was predicated on maintaining state sovereignty—the nation-state form seemed to be on its way out after 1945. Catholics celebrated the United Nations, the Marshall Plan, the war crimes trials at Nuremberg, the consolidation of NATO and the possibilities of a European Army, early moves towards European economic union, and so on. It is doubtful whether or not these phenomena justified the enthusiasm felt by Catholics, insofar as the period was largely marked, as Alan Milward has argued, by the salvation of the nation-state form as the central axis of political life.[84] Indeed, it would soon be spread around the world, despite the federalist leanings of such Catholic decolonizing figures as Léopold Senghor.[85] In the crucial years of the late 1940s, though, federalism played a major role in closing the legitimacy deficit faced by

[83] Jean de Fabrégues, "Saurons-nous faire l'Europe?", *La France Catholique* 23, 70 (19 March 1948), 1.

[84] Alan Milward, *European Rescue of the Nation-State*, 2nd ed. (New York, 2000). Milward's whole analysis depends on the fact that, in his estimation, everyone before him had not understood this to be the case, including the actors themselves. In other words, the *reality* of the situation is irrelevant here, insofar as I'm trying to show how the discourse of anti-sovereign federalism, which was, *pace* Milward, hegemonic, participated in, or constituted, the Catholic political culture of legitimacy.

[85] Gary Wilder, "African Socialism as Political Theology: Leopold Sedar Senghor's Redemptive Vision of Decolonization," presentation given at the New York Area Seminar in Intellectual and Cultural History, December 2010.

democratic governments. "The people," Adenauer told his cabinet in 1952, "must be given a new ideology. It can only be a European one."[86]

Our guide through the thicket of postwar federalist activism will be Eugen Kogon, who was one of the most prominent federalist organizers and intellectuals in Western Europe. His postwar career was marked by cooperation, both practical and intellectual, with the Americans; they had, after all, liberated him from Buchenwald, and it was in an American jeep that Kogon had rumbled in search of Walter Dirks.[87] He quickly entered the employ of American military's Psychological Warfare Division, which charged Kogon and other inmates with gathering evidence about Buchenwald's operation. Following the suggestion of General McClure, chief of that division, Kogon turned this research into a book, which became a massive, and massively influential, indictment and analysis of the National Socialist system of camps entitled *Der SS-Staat* (published in America as *The Theory and Practice of Hell*).[88] Again, the Americans were involved: in 1947, paper was allocated for 100,000 copies of Kogon's book—the only book specifically about recent events to receive the honor. The chief of OMGUS's Publications Control Branch gives an indication of why it was so valued: it was an exemplary work to convince the German "that he needs to stop thinking in

[86] Quoted Judt, *Postwar* 275. There were, to be sure, fissures within Catholic federalism. Conceptually, these debates pitted *Abendland*-style traditionalists, committed to Europe as an independent project, and more Atlantic figures who sought to bind Western Europe with Anglo-America. But, as Ronald Granieri has pointed out, these differences remained more ideological than practical: the particular political circumstances of the late 1940s and 1950s allowed them to be effaced (see Ronald Granieri, *The Ambivalent Alliance* (New York, 2003)). For evidence, we might look to the *Katholische Europa-Liga*, the most integralist of the major federalist organizations. Frau Schmittmann, one of its standard-bearers, attempted to link federalism more tightly to medieval concepts of Christian *Abendland*, and were critical of Adenauer-style *Westbindung*. But she did not conclude that conservative Catholics should dissociate themselves from mainstream federalist movements, including the more progressive ones that had Kogon and other left-leaning Catholics at the helm: the *Europa-Liga* portrayed itself as a pressure group within the federalist camp, and not as an embattled force for Catholic reaction (Frau Benedikt Schmittman, "Europa als Aufgabe," *Föderalistische Hefte* 2 (1949), 546-7). My perspective here is quite different from that in Vanessa Conze, *Das Europa der Deutschen*. Conze believes that these two camps were fundamentally different, with different ideologies and different intellectual roots. Her case is, I believe, severely overstated: as she herself points out, these two camps ended up in the same position, practically speaking. I'll grant that there were differences in rhetorical inflection, but not that these greatly mattered.

[87] Kogon reports as well that the Americans would only give the publishing license for *Frankfurter Hefte* to him, and not to Dirks (presumably because of his left-wing past). Kogon, *Dieses merkwürdige, wichtige Leben* 78, 90.

[88] Ibid. 80.

terms of a narrow nationalism and to start thinking in broadly European or world terms."[89] Kogon also, at the invitation of the Rockefeller Foundation, visited America in 1948.[90]

Kogon expended the political capital gained from this book, alongside his aforementioned editorship of the equally successful *Frankfurter Hefte,* almost solely in the service of federalism. In the late 1940s, while Dirks bemoaned the return of capitalism, Kogon devoted himself above all to federalism. He believed, as he had since the 1920s, that the fundamental problem of European modernity was a political one (he later said that he spent so much of the *Hefte*'s money on early European movements that he nearly bankrupted it[91]). In an early 1947 article for *Frankfurter Hefte*, he declared that capitalism and individualism were dead, never to return. "But what is neither dead nor drawing its last breath, but rather still lives from the past epoch of individualism […] is *nationalism*."[92] It was against this specter that Kogon, along with a bevy of former Catholic royalists, marshaled his considerable energies.

His prominence was such that Adenauer grilled him about possible political ambitions, which Kogon waved off. "If I were your age, Herr Kogon," Adenauer commented to the far-younger Kogon, "I too would want to be no more than a notary and a breeder of roses."[93] Of course, Kogon did much more than that, and an account of his postwar activities provides a rough guide through the alphabet soup of late 1940s federalist organizations. In a 1949 letter to Dirks, he

---

[89] List of mass editions on Berlin sector, memo dated 29 October 1947; Douglas Waples, "Suggested Titles for High Editions," memo dated 10 September 1948, both in Box 237, Folder 30, Information Control Division, Records of the Press Branch, 260/390/42/19/4, National Archives.

[90] Kogon, *Dieses merkwürdige, wichtige Leben* 112.

[91] Norbert Seitz, "Wach machen für die Probleme der Zeit," *Frankfurter Rundschau,* 31 January 2003

[92] Kogon, "Über die Situation," 20.

[93] This 1949 meeting was reported by Wilhelm Cornides, interviewed in 1961 by the great historian of European unification, Walter Lipgens. "Gespräch mit Cornides über Kontakte Kogon-Adenauer." Dated 13 March 1961. Historical Archives of the European Union, WL-92.

referred to his activities during these years as "laying European eggs (what a dreadful image!)."[94] Dreadful it may have been, but it was accurate. We have access to his own words as to which of his affiliations he found most important: in a 1952 letter to Adenauer, he claimed to speak for federalism "as president of the German *Europa-Union*, president of the central committee of the *Union Européenne des Fédéralists* and leading member of the European Movement."[95] He here indicates his central position in the postwar federalist landscape. Let's take these in order. The *Europa-Union* was the most important federalist movement within Germany, eventually growing to 20,000 members. This movement was the German branch of the international UEF, whose Vichy origins were traced in the previous chapter: by the late 1940s, the UEF had emerged as one of the two most important constellations of federalist activity in Europe. Kogon was elected president of the *Europa-Union* in 1949, and president of the UEF in 1950. The last group Kogon mentions was the European Movement: the international organization headed by Churchill and Duncan Sandys. He had been elected to head the German delegation to this movement in 1949. As all of this implies, federalism was, like Kogon himself, a transnational phenomenon. Whereas Catholic international life in 1945-6 had been devoted to left-Catholicism, by this period federalism was the primary axis of transnational Catholic intellectual life. Eugen Kogon still traveled to France, but not in the name of a socialist Europe: he now went to strategize with the ex-monarchists of *La Fédération*.[96]

Kogon, therefore, provides a unique way to access what federalism *meant* in the postwar period—to access, that is, why federalism in particular seemed such an insightful and obvious optic throughout the Catholic public sphere. In discussing Kogon's understanding of the term, our basic

[94] Eugen Kogon to Walter Dirks, 23 August 1949, Nachlaß Dirks, Box 40.

[95] Eugen Kogon to Konrad Adenauer, 8 July 1952, enclosed in letter from Kogon to Staatssekretär Lenz, 8 July 1952, Kogon Sammlung Personalia, Box 5391, Friedrich-Albert-Stiftung, Bonn.

[96] Kogon, *Dieses merkwüridge, wichtige Leben* 103, 108.

thesis will be that deep continuities can be discerned between his post-1945 federalism and the hatred of the nation-state project that had been Kogon's stock-in-trade since his time as a royalist student of Othmar Spann in 1920s Vienna. To clarify this, I'll turn to Kogon's most revealing postwar consideration of these issues: a 1946 essay for *Frankfurter Hefte* called, simply, "Democracy and Federalism." "Modern states," Kogon begins, "received their shape from individualism. The roots of this development can be found in the transition from the Middle Ages to modernity." At this stage, we became obsessed with "the freedom of the individual, to which all power was assigned." This led, unsurprisingly, to the "atomization of society," the precondition for both liberal democracy, with its "fanaticism of individual freedom," and "collectivism," the "grandson" of this same atomization. "Individualism and collectivism," he writes, "are bound together in a common intuition of mankind." Despite, or because of, its lionization of individual freedom, the turn to modernity leads directly the all-powerful state. Specifically, he pointed out that totalitarianism was a direct, if paradoxical, offspring of the modern obsession with the freedom of the individual. To emancipate ourselves from slavery to the state, we must reinstate all of those intermediary bodies—the family, the factory, the school, the church—that were delegitimized in the transition to étatiste political modernity. "Federalism," he writes, "is the organization of power in recognition of the rights and duties that grow from natural and objective responsibilities."[97]

None of this is new. Kogon reproduces here the basic theory of the modern state that we saw in Part I: royalists in both Germany and France shared this story of modernity's original sin and its political repercussions. But Kogon's conclusions differ radically from those of his youth, and an analysis article's new features will help to show how Kogon, and with him the majority of the

[97] Eugen Kogon, "Demokratie und Föderalismus," *Frankfurter Hefte* 1, 6 (September 1946), 66-78, here 67, 69, 70, 72-4, 76.

Catholic royalists who had been anti-modern federalists in the 1920s, could agree to the legitimacy of the postwar order.

One major shift was the belief that certain forms of democracy might, in principle, be compatible with an overturning of modernity's "fanaticism of individual freedom." This belief, tendrils of which could be spotted in the royalists of the early 1920s, was widespread and will be discussed in the next section. It is enough to note here that, in titling his piece "Democracy and Federalism," Kogon did not envision them as antonyms. Rather, the article, and Kogon's postwar activities in general, were dedicated to finding rapprochement with democracy, a *fait accompli* of the postwar period, and the federalist ideals he had espoused for decades.

Otherwise, the major notable feature of Kogon's essay were the new authorities that he called upon: "Europe," the United Nations, and the United States (he had had nothing but bile for the League in the 1920s).[98] In other words, geopolitical events convinced Kogon that things were moving in the right direction—that a revolution was not necessary to unravel what he called the "fiction" of nation-state sovereignty. There was no need to call for a fundamental political reordering, as events were already tending towards federalism: even though Kogon was nonplussed by Adenauer's liberal tendencies, he still supported Adenauer overall, and seems to have counted him a friend. Kogon wrote as a disaffected insider to the system, and not as an outsider railing for its overthrow.[99]

Kogon was responding to something real in international life: European leaders were speaking the language of federalism, and the United Nations seemed like a more serious and worthy enterprise than the League of Nations. The Nuremberg trials, at which Kogon served as a witness and which featured a Catholic MRP-affiliated lawyer at the head of the French team, convinced

[98] Ibid. 75-6.

[99] Eugen Kogon, "Zwischen Atlantik-Pakt und Schuman Plan," *Frankfurter Hefte* 5, 6 (June 1950), 569-71, here 570.

Catholics that law need not be confined to the nation-state. Catholics were no longer voices in the wilderness: federalist congresses were taking place at which Catholics could join hands with socialists and even Americans, decrying the pernicious leviathan of the state. The Marshall Plan, widely celebrated in the Catholic press, indicated that the heretical belief in liberal markets was coming to a close.[100] In Kogon's perception, firmly rooted in the rhetoric, if not the reality, of postwar political culture, nobody was committed any longer to the nation-state. We are, he might have written, all federalists now. At a 1949 speech delivered in Berlin, Eugen Kogon made this clear: Kogon "deemed it auspicious," wrote a journalist covering the event, "that political tendencies from the conservatives to the liberals, and from Christian Democrats to Socialists, are represented within [the European Movement]."[101]

Specifically, I want to think about three groups whose federalist inclinations led Catholics to embrace a political culture of legitimacy: socialists, liberals, and Americans. In the 1920s, there had been essentially no collaboration, at least on an ideological level, between socialists and Catholics: while the Zentrum and the SPD may have been the backbones of Weimar's stability, such as it was, this was a marriage of convenience and not of conviction (as evidenced by the ease of the divorce between 1930 and 1933). In France, the SFIO participated in the anti-clerical Cartel des Gauches, while even this looked positively rosy compared to Catholic-socialist relations in Austria. After the war, though, there was much more full-blooded cooperation between the movements. Socialists (i.e. members of socialist parties, not merely Christian Democrats of socialist conviction) were regular contributors to Catholic periodicals in both France and Germany; moreover, socialists like Paul-Henri Spaak and Altiero Spinelli were, next to Catholics, the most significant leaders of federalist

[100] I have already quoted Kogon's praise of the Marshall Plan; for another account from a familiar figure, see François Perroux, *Le Plan Marshall ou l'Europe nécessaire au monde* (Paris, 1948).

[101] "Wahrung der Menschenrechte," *Volksblatt* 23 June 1949.

organizations (the UEF counted numerous socialist organizations, notably Henri Frenay's *Socialisme et liberté,* among its ranks). In Germany, federalism was one of the major axes that separated the CDU and SPD from the KDP, which saw federalism as backwards-looking and opposed it. The SPD of the Weimar period had been a defender of the *Einheitsstaat*—as the agent of economic change—but this began to change after 1945, as socialist leaders in exile had been converted to more federalist principles.[102] Social democrats, declared a postwar statement of SPD principles, "know that the unrestricted sovereignty of national states is a thing of the past. […] German social democrats want a United States of Europe."[103] In France, too, Léon Blum re-emerged from a concentration camp to lead the SFIO in a more federalist-friendly direction (although he emphasized that it should not take an anti-Soviet tack); he was an honorary president, for instance, of the same European Movement in which Kogon considered himself a "leading member."[104] *La Fédération* was closely allied with the socialist Claude-Marcel Hytte and his journal, *La république moderne*. In November 1949, the MRP, the SFIO, and the Radicals decided on a joint resolution hoping that "a genuine European political authority may be defined and set up as soon as possible."[105]

Liberals, too, were convinced of the need for federalist solutions: in a remarkable article for La Fédération, Jean Daujat, a former Action française royalist Catholic, trumpeted the newfound alliance between neoliberalism and federalism. After beginning with the standard statement that liberalism and totalitarianism are the two largest enemies of true federalism, Daujat pivots: "It is therefore interesting to see the courageous and vigorous combat undertaken, alongside us, by a

[102] R. Berndt, "Der Föderalismus in den Nachkriegskonzeptionen der SPD," in *1945: Der Sieg über den Faschismus und die Politik der Internationalen Sozialdemokratie*, ed. Johannes Glasneck (Martin-Luther Universität: Halle, 1987), 176-187, here 177. This should not be over-emphasized; Schumacher and other figures saw federalism as a shill for Americanization, and argued against the partition of Germany.

[103] *Documents on the History of European Integration*, Vol. 3, 469.

[104] See Léon Blum, "The Western Family," in *Documents on the History of European Integration*, Vol. 3, 34-5.

[105] *Documents on the History of European Integration*, Vol. 3, 23.

school calling itself 'neoliberal', of which the best representatives are L. von Mises, Hayek, and, especially, W. Röpke." Unlike the liberals of the past, who had a debased and secular understanding of man, the neo-liberals recognize that "there can only be an authentic safeguard of liberty and diversity along the road of multiple and freely constituted communities, which are themselves federalized into hierarchies."[106]

As Daujat suggests, the liberalism of Aron and Röpke was well-attuned to the federalism of Catholics: they had given up on the strong ontological claims of early liberals, and retreated into a more historicist liberalism, one alive to the importance of Christianity's heritage while still maintaining the traditional liberal fear of étatisme. Both Röpke and Aron were critical of the disaggregative effects of capitalist modernity, and sought to undercut it through the revival of intermediary communities between man and the state—just as Catholics were doing. This similarity in sensibilities underwrote the remarkable extent to which they published in Catholic journals, as described earlier. Röpke's Die deutsche Frage recommends German decentralization—the end of the unified-Germany experiment, and the return to a de-Prussified Germany of autonomous Länder—as the only way forwards.[107] In his book on international order, also published in 1945, Röpke theorized that Europeans were living through "the crisis of the nation (especially as organized in the Großstaat)." When we think of "the new national or international order," there is "in both places the same solution, which we recommend as the only one: federalism."[108] Raymond Aron, for his part, was also an enthusiastic supporter of Western European federalism: the idea of Europe, he

[106] Jean Daujat, "Néolibéralisme et fédéralisme," *La Fédération* 38 (March 1948), 31

[107] Wilhelm Röpke, *The German Question* 186.

[108] Wilhelm Röpke, *Internationale Ordnung* (Zürich, 1945), 55-6.

claimed, was an "ineluctable historical necessity."[109] In 1950, Aron and Kogon served as the two rapporteurs of a European Movement congress on "Germany and Europe."[110]

Like Röpke and Aron, Catholic federalists supported an "Atlantic Europe": a Western European alliance that would be folded into a Western bloc as a bulwark against a Bolshevik Eastern bloc (Röpke called for a "*Pax Anglo-Saxonica*, largely regulated by the United States"[111]). Recall from the last chapter that left-Catholics had feared this solution, but by 1949 it seemed, as Aron would say, ineluctable. Early hopes began to seem naïve in 1947, when Eastern European delegates were kept from attending the UEF's first conference. 1948 was the *annus mirabilis* for this transition to a Cold War federalism: the Prague Coup and the Marshall Plan convinced prominent supporters of Europe as a "Third Force," notably Eugen Kogon and Alexandre Marc, that there was no choice but to align with America. The Soviets had no interest in European federalism, and, although federalists were loathe to say it outright, there was no doubt that European federalism had become, by 1950, firmly enlisted into the very bloc politics it had pledged to forestall.[112] Kogon resigned his post from the Communist-leaning *Vereinigung der Verfolgten des Naziregimes* in 1949 for this reason, and took part in the founding conference of the Congress for Cultural Freedom in Berlin.[113] He wrote in *Der Monat*, the CCF's German organ, that only a "Europe that is bound with the USA" could defeat resurgent nationalism (of which Bolshevism was a variant). The next year (1950),

---

[109] *Documents on the History of European Integration* 85-6, for instance; for this quotation, see Raymond Aron, "L'idée de L'europe," *La Fédération* 39 (April 1948), 6. Aron was not at all as committed to federalism as were Röpke or his Catholic interlocutors, but he was at least sympathetic.

[110] This is described in William Durkee's untitled report to the directors of the American Committee on United Europe, undated [1951], Exhibit B, available in Walter Bedell Smith Papers, Dwight D. Eisenhower Library (Abilene, Kansas), Box 4, Folder 1.

[111] Wilhelm Röpke, *Internationale Ordnung* 296.

[112] See Bertrand Vayssière, *Vers une Europe fédérale?,* Part II for a detailed account.

[113] As reported in *Der Abend,* 8 August 1949.

Kogon announced at the UEF's third conference that Bolshevism could only be staved off under American protection and "on the basis of a liberal constitution."[114]

Kogon was no maverick here: the guiding principles of the UEF in 1950 spoke of the "Soviet menace," and praised the Americans for taking up the European cause when the continent's own volition had failed. The American measures (NATO, primarily) were seen as so necessary "that it can be paradoxically affirmed that those European states which refuse to band together in order to better safeguard their sovereignty will have definitely compromised it."[115] We might look at the speech made by Kogon's predecessor as president of the UEF, Hendrik Brugmans, at the 1948 UEF conference, held in Rome (which featured a visit and speech from Pius XII). "The first important fact," Brugmans announced, "is the increasingly clear isolation of Communism and the USSR." "No alliance is possible," he adds, "between those who […] wish the Marshall Plan to succeed and those who are only concerned to ruin the production effort in Europe."[116] This was believed across Catholic Europe at the time; recall the pro-American sentiment in *La Fédération* and *Neues Abendland*—Europe's two most strident Catholic, federalist journals—described above. To give just a few more examples from the Catholic public sphere: In Fabrègues's *La France Catholique,* a characteristic 1948 article argued that only the Americans could lead the way to a bright, federalist, future, while Fabrègues himself argued, plausibly enough, that European federalism had a chance at working because Europe was uniting against a common enemy: Communism.[117]

---

[114] Eugen Kogon, "La defense de l'Europe," delivered at UEF Strasbourg congress, 17-19 November 1950, , Historical Archives of the European Union, UEF-101.

[115] "Déclaration de politique générale," *Les Documents du IIIème Congrès de l'UEF*, Historical Archives of the European Union, UEF-101.

[116] "Discours du president Henri Brugmans," included in the "Notes et extraits" from the Rome Congress, available in Historical Archives of the European Union, UEF 100.

[117] René Pinon, "La politique française et le fédéralisme," *La France Catholique* 23, 67 (27 February 1948), 1, 4; Jean de Fabrègues, "A l'Europe qui se cherche les catholiques doivent enseigner," *La France Catholique* 28, 95 (10 Sept 48), 1.

Catholics had every reason to believe that the Americans were on their side and could be trusted.[118] "Is it true, first of all, that my government is favorable to European federalism?" the American ambassador to France asked in *La Fédération*. "Yes, it is a fact."[119] This was widely recognized by Catholics: "The United States," it was reported in *Cahiers du Monde Nouveau* in 1951, "are in the process of creating European Union, and they have already had some success."[120] America was a highly enthusiastic supporter of European integration, which was seen as the simultaneous solution to the problem of West Germany, West European economic recovery, and West European defense. One historian has gone so far as to say that, after 1945, "'Europe' existed mainly in the minds of American diplomats." Clearly, this is an overstatement, but a telling one.[121] They were not merely opponents of Bolshevism, but steadfast supporters of European federalist organizations, including the UEF. The most important organization here was the American Committee on a United Europe [ACUE], founded in 1948 and dedicated to European federalism precisely as a means of warding off Communism. Its first chairman was William Donovan, wartime head of the OSS, while his protégé, Allen Dulles, served as vice-chairman. They were joined on the executive committee by Thomas Braden, one of the founders of the Congress for Cultural Freedom. As this roster indicates, the ACUE was a Cold War institution, staffed by leading lights of the American intelligence community and with the access to deep coffers that implied.

Just as the CIA was funding a whole bevy of European cultural activities, the ACUE was the conduit through which American money flowed into European federalist movements. While the European Movement seems to have been the largest recipient of ACUE funds, there is no doubt

---

[118] For a political-military account of the Americans' support for European integration, see Michael Hogan, *The Marshall Plan* (Cambridge, 1987), Chapter 2.

[119] Jefferson Caffery, "Les Etats-Unis devant le fédéralisme européen", 273.

[120] A.H. Adrian, "Sens et urgence de l'union européenne," *Cahiers du Monde Nouveau* 7, 46 (1951), 118-25, here 122.

[121] Gillingham, "From Morgenthau Plan to Schuman Plan" 112.

that the UEF—the more Catholic of the two major federalist organizations, and one that Donovan himself considered to be to be "the largest and most effective group within the European Movement"—also received ACUE funding from 1950 onwards.[122] Donovan, Friedrich, and other members of the ACUE circle were convinced that, as Donovan wrote in a 1951 letter, "an effective and practical unity of Western Europe is the most important development which we can encourage." In the same letter, he went on to give a realistic account of the state of European federalism:

> The idea of a free, united and independent Europe rejecting neutralism and regarding its relationship with America as one of 'friendship on equal terms' has become an important force in creating the morale necessary to sustain free Europe's military and economic efforts.[123]

American support for European federalism extended far beyond the sack of cash reportedly placed on Thomas Braden's desk in its service.[124] In March 1947, for instance, William Fulbright presented a Congressional resolution declaring America's support for European federalism, while Truman himself was a warm and public supporter of federalism. Paul-Henri Spaak, a major player in European federalism, made a tour of the United States and gave a number of speeches about his experiences, helping to build awareness of the Americans' attitude.[125]

To recap: federalism was the major discourse through which Catholics came to accept the legitimacy of the postwar order. There were deep continuities, both in terms of ideology and in

---

[122] Quoted on Richard J. Aldrich, "European Integration: An American Intelligence Connection," in *Building Postwar Europe: National Decision-Makers and European Institutions, 1948-63*, ed. Anne Deighton (New York, 1995), 159-79, here 169-70. For more details on the ACUE and the various European movements, see Antonin Cohen, "La Constitution européenne: Ordre politique, utopie juridique et guerre froide", *Critique internationale* 26 (2005), 119-131.

[123] William Donovan to Walter Bedell Smith, 25 July 1951, Walter Bedell Smith Papers, Box 4, Folder 1.

[124] Hugh Wilford, "Calling the Tune? The CIA, the British Left and the Cold War, 1945-1960," in *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe, 1945-1960*, ed. Giles-Scott-Smith and Hans Krabbendam (London, 2003), 41-52, here 46.

[125] This is described in William Durkee's report to the directors of the American Committee on United Europe, cited above.

terms of personnel, between the Cold War federalism of the late 1940s and the royalist federalism of the 1920s. The political valence had changed, however: whereas royalist federalism, as we saw in Part I, was launched against liberal-democratic states, theorizing that democracy led necessarily to étatisme, this was no longer the case after 1945. There were two basic reasons for this: there were some changes internal to the Catholic public sphere, and Catholics were not immune to the vogue for America and for democracy that swept Western Europe after 1945. But the more important change was exogenous: Catholics of the 1920s faced liberal democratic regimes, and an international order, that was steadfastly hostile to their own ideas about Europe, and about sovereignty. In the late 1940s, this was no longer the case: liberals, socialists, and Americans *agreed* with Catholics that Europe needed to be reorganized on federalist lines, and in a more integral way than had been the case with the League. In this case, as in others, the language of the Cold War had deep resonance with that of Catholicism.

Atlantic Catholicism (II): Jacques Maritain and Political Pluralism

"Decentralized power" was one of the phrases in Bell's succinct definition of the end of ideology: another was "political pluralism." These might seem to be synonyms, but Bell at least didn't think so, and for our own analytical purposes they can be split. The previous section traced the Catholic rapprochement with newly-hegemonic ideas of "decentralized power": to wit, European federalism. This section will focus on "political pluralism" as the name for the domestic analogue of federalism. Instead of discussing federalization upwards towards federalist bodies, this section will focus on federalization downwards, towards the family, the church, and other institutions of civil society. As explained earlier, "pluralism" was the precise term in political philosophy, which did not filter down into general discourse with much frequency; "anti-totalitarianism" was the more popular version.

As with federalism, Catholics had reason to believe that Western European states were moving in a pluralist, anti-totalitarian direction: most obviously, Communists had everywhere left the government and the remaining governments were tied financially and discursively to the anti-Communist pluralism streaming from Washington. Although this period is usually remembered as one of social welfare étatisme, that is not how it appeared at the time, at least in the late 1940s. National life was, instead, depoliticized, as families, churches, and other institutions of local civil society re-emerged from the fog of war to structure social life.[126] This seeming paradox was most apparent in Germany, which was constructing a social market economy (theorized by neoliberal humanists like Röpke and put into practice by Catholics like Adenauer and Erhard). As Müller-Armack described it, the social market economy would deny the state the power to "command" the economy, while also putting in place a number of structures (worker's cooperatives, family allowances, and so on) that would parcel sovereignty amongst a series of institutions instead of demolishing it in the name of the market.[127]

Our key figure here will be Jacques Maritain, who made more explicitly pluralist arguments than any other Catholic political philosopher; he also was at pains to make it clear that he was arguing from within the bosom of hegemonic Cold War social science. He had, recall, spent the war years in America, writing paeans to democracy and to America. After the Liberation, he was appointed as ambassador to the Vatican, where he worked to further the anti-Communist policies of his Pius XII; we saw him in the last chapter defending the papal letter against the MRP's policies of nationalization. In 1948, he stepped down from his post at the Vatican to return to teaching and lecturing at Princeton. Unlike Kogon, he had been skeptical of Resistance Europe from the

[126] Martin Conway, "Democracy in Postwar Western Europe: The Triumph of a Political model."

[127] Nicholls, *Freedom with Responsibility*, Chapters 6-9. In Chapter 12, Nicholls shows how the SPD, following the lead of theorists like Richard Löwenthal and Karl Schiller, slowly came to accept the fundamentals of the social market economy.

beginning. The French intelligentsia, he wrote to Yves Simon in 1945, "is passing through a perfectly terrible moment. […] The people are good, the intellectuals weak and intoxicated. All the old and new poisons are going to their head."[128] As Resistance Europe morphed into its Atlantic successor, Maritain became an enormously influential figure, both inside and outside the Catholic public sphere. He was involved in drafting the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and he served as a French representative to the second UNESCO conference in 1947. His disciples, meanwhile, were active in the MRP and in the committee drafting the Italian Constitution. He was widely read in Germany, too: no less a personage than Joseph Eberle wrote that Maritain had "one of the best heads in any country."[129]

The reader familiar with Maritain might wonder why he is being presented as a pluralist and not as a democrat. Although he is currently most famous as a Catholic theorist of democracy, he was not a theorist of "Christian Democracy" in any meaningful sense of the word, as we saw in Chapter 6.[130] Maritain didn't care about parliamentary democracy *qua* form of government, and he continued to see "liberal democracy" as the antechamber to totalitarianism. Maritain only supported a *pluralist* democracy: pluralism, and not democracy, is thus the proper way to understand Maritain's postwar political theory. This leads to a more general methodological point: this chapter is emphatically not an account of how Catholics came to accept an essentialized notion of "democracy." It is about how, at a particular moment, a certain conjunction of forces operating under the aegis of democratic states was conceived of as legitimate by the transnational Catholic public sphere. This is not to deny

---

[128] Jacques Maritain to Yves Simon, 10 March 1946, Maritain Archives, Notre Dame, Box 30.

[129] Quoted in review of Eberle, *Der Weg ins Freie* (1946), *Neues Abendland* 1, 11 (Jan 46), 31

[130] Maritain was certainly received in Europe, sometimes by former enemies, in the guise of a federalist/pluralist, and not as a democrat. See, for instance, Maritain, "Europa und der föderalistische Gedanke," *Neues Abendland* 2, 6 (Sept 47), 193-9; Jean Le Jamtel, "Crépuscule de la Civilisation?" *La France Catholique* 20, 866 (2 December 1945), 1. For another German example, see Karl Thieme, *Das Schicksal der Deutschen* (Basel, 1945), 7; Ferber, "Föderalistisches Brevier, Teil II" *Föderalistische Hefte* 1 (1948), 140-3, here 143.

the enormity of what happened: for the first time, Western Europe was united under the rule of stable, republican democracies. But we should also not forget, as Charles Maier and Martin Conway have pointed out, that *stability* is the more relevant axis through which to view this period than revolution.[131] While European nations experienced rapid and total changes in governmental form, a basic stability in social-economic structure was maintained. And, as was discussed earlier in this chapter, an emphasis on stability should direct our attention away from the state and towards the discourses and institutions of civil society that were the true guarantors of stability.

This was the sort of stability that Maritain theorized in his postwar works in political theory, most notably *Man and the State*: an influential work based on a wide-ranging set of lectures delivered in 1949. Drawing on contemporary (and secular) sociology, medieval theology, and classical philosophy, Maritain presented a powerful vision of human society, and one that had a family resemblance to non-Catholic social theories of the time. Jason Stevens, in a chapter about this period's political culture in America, takes his epigraph from this work.[132] The intellectual project was not rooted only in Maritain's Atlantic present, but also in his integralist past. Indeed, it can best be seen as attempting, like so much of Catholic political thought at the time, to draw the connections between the two—a task that, it turned out, was like fitting a square peg in a square hole.

Just as he had for decades, Maritain set his sights on the state sovereignty. He begins by drawing a familiar distinction between "civil society" and the "State." These are the two spheres into which "society" can be divided (in distinction to the "community," which exists at the level of the unconscious, language, mores, etc.). The "body politic," or "civil society," is composed of a complex

---

[131] On stability as a basic optic through which to view this period, see Charles S. Maier, "The Two Postwar Eras and the Conditions for Stability in Twentieth-Century Western Europe,"; Martin Conway, "The Rise and Fall of Western Europe's Democratic Age, 1945-73."

[132] Stevens, *God-Fearing and Free*, 245.

of overlapping institutions devoted to the common good: families, churches, the press, labor unions, and so on. The important feature here is that it is acephalous, divided into multiple legitimate authorities. "Such," Maritain concludes, "is the element of pluralism inherent in every truly political society."[133] The State is only one of these authorities, and a quite limited one. "[The State] is not a man or a body of men," Maritain writes, but "a set of institutions combined into a topmost machine." By denying the Hobbesean equation of state and man, Maritain gives voice to a traditional fear of tyranny; more arresting is his declaration that the state should not be seen as a *body of men*: how else could a constitutional convention or a parliament be conceived? Insofar as these were communities dedicated to rational goals, they would be counted as part of the body politic. The state itself is "instrumental": a Weberean diagnosis that Maritain actually celebrates (note the "machine" language). It deals in laws of mutual security, but should not be linked with any substantial morality. This would represent a category error, subsuming the circumscribed "Society" of the "State" to the morality that is more properly founded on "community" of the nation and the complex of legitimate authorities that make up civil society. This error, it almost goes without saying, was made in the nineteenth century and led to the twin totalitarianisms of the twentieth. Maritain went on to deconstruct the concept of "sovereignty" altogether. Drawing on the history of "sovereignty" from Bodin to Schmitt, Maritain showed the notion to be predicated on ontological distinction between the sovereign and ruled that usurped the privileged ontological status of God himself. "It is my contention that political philosophy must get rid of the word, as well as the concept, of Sovereignty." With a nod to Kogon, Maritain concluded that the heretical illusion of state sovereignty had led directly to Buchenwald.[134]

---

[133] Maritain, *Man and the State* (Chicago, 1951), 6, 11 (see 108 for the equation of "body politic" and "civil society").

[134] Ibid. 11, 13, 17, 24, 29, 72.

The only solution to the modern impasse is "the advent of some new personalist and pluralist regime." Drawing on the Scottish sociologist Robert MacIver's notion of the "multigroup society," Maritain dreamed that civil society might come to the rescue and obviate the need for the bacillus of sovereignty:

> All organic forms of social and economic activity, even the largest and most comprehensive ones, would start from the bottom, I mean from the free initiative of and mutual tension between the particular groups, working communities, cooperative agencies, unions, associations, federated bodies of producers and consumers, rising in tiers and institutionally recognized.[135]

Maritain's fundamental, animating binary, familiar from both Enlightened thought and Catholic sociology, thus divides civil society from the state.[136] "[T]he basic political reality is not the State," Maritain concludes, "but the body politic with its multifarious institutions, the multiple communities which it involves, and the moral community which grows out of it."[137]

As in the 1920s, Maritain was only the brightest star in a constellation of Catholic publicists opposed to the principle of sovereignty. "When the individual European states recognize that absolute sovereignty is a fiction," Kogon announced in a 1949 speech in Berlin, "the path to the creation of a United States of Europe will be cleared."[138] The language of pluralism was also a mainstay of Catholic political culture at the time: "Pluralism or Ideology of the State" was how one 1946 article in *La Vie Intellectuelle* posed the choices facing France (clearly favoring the former).[139] In his account of the 1946 *Semaine Sociale*, which brought together three thousand social Catholics and a

---

[135] Ibid. 22.

[136] The literature here is enormous; for two contributions from quite different perspectives, see Daniel Gordon, *Citizens without Sovereignty* (Princeton, 1994); Reinhart Koselleck, *Critique and Crisis* (Cambridge, MA, 1998).

[137] Maritain, *Man and the State* 202.

[138] Quoted in "Eugen Kogon: Alle europaeischen Staaten müssen an der Ruhr beteiligt werden." Deutscher Pressediest 193, Berlin, 23 June 1949. Available in Kogon's Sammlung Personalia, Box 5391.

[139] A. Latreille, "Pluralisme ou idéologie d'État," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 14, 7 (July 1946), 33-41

handful of MRP ministers, Pierre-Henri Simon declared that "pluralism" was the concept that unified the disparate group. "[T]his pluralism," Simon noted, "is entirely different from pure liberalism" in that it has "respect for the multiple forms of life" and "unequivocally refuses the atomistic conception of a society composed of indifferent parts, whether tending towards individualist anarchy […] or totalitarian tyranny."[140] In his review of *Man and the State*, Aurel Kolnai—whom we met in Chapter 5 as a member of Hildebrand's circle in 1930s Vienna—declared that "Maritain's constant stressing of social *pluralism* deserves our full attention and approval. It is in keeping with the best traditions in Catholic social thought[.]"[141]

We can see pluralist theories in many major Catholic thinkers: François Perroux's trajectory is interesting here. We have met Perroux throughout this dissertation: he was the most influential of the Catholic corporatist economists, and was one of the leading lights in Pétain's social-scientific apparatus. He and Maritain had thus been on opposite sides of the war, but, as happened with so many former Catholic enemies, they were united behind Atlantic Catholicism: Perroux was, like Maritain, a European federalist and celebrant of American involvement on the continent.[142] He was also a pluralist in Maritain's sense, as he clarified in an article published in *La Fédération* a few weeks before Maritain's lectures. He begins, in a trope that should by now seem numbingly familiar to readers of this dissertation, with the invocation of an ancien régime organized into a "hierarchy of communities: territorial (villages), professional (trade organizations), spiritual (parishes)." This had of course been destroyed by Jacobinism. Here Perroux would veer from his older solutions: he had previously wished to install Catholic ideology at the heart of a corporatist state. But now, this was

[140] Pierre-Henri Simon, "La Semaine Sociale de Strasbourg," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 14, 10 (October 1946), 74-8, here 75.

[141] Aurel Kolnai, "The Synthesis of Christ and Anti-Christ [review of *Man and the State*]", *Integrity* 5, 11 (August 1951), 40-45, here 43.

[142] François Perroux, *Le Plan Marshall ou l'Europe nécessaire au monde*

off the table and he allied himself with non-theocratic Atlantic Catholicism. The evil of Jacobinism, Perroux now held, was not the specifics of its ideology, but the fact that it was ideological at all: the essence of Jacobinism is "the *use of power and organized force in the service of an ideology*." This created "the germ of totalitarianism." Perroux declared, in a formulation almost identical to Maritain's, that a solution required the recognition that "pluralism is inherent to societies of men." This, in turn, requires supporting the West in the Cold War: Russia proposes "an ideological form" for the world, while the Americans are beyond ideology.[143]

Similar themes can be tracked in the postwar writings of Franz-Josef Schöningh. As one of few Bavarian Catholics to enjoy wide name-recognition, alongside physical survival and a clean anti-Nazi record, he became quite prominent after 1945, as editor of *Hochland* and cultural editor of the newly-founded *Süddeutsche Zeitung*. Like other figures discussed in this chapter, he was not a partisan— in the judgment of the Americans, Schöningh "favors but does not belong to the CSU"[144]—but he did support the legitimacy of the new Western European regimes and their Cold War mission. His political pluralism can best be seen in a widely-discussed essay, titled simply "Christian Politics?", that appeared in *Hochland* in April 1949. The answer to the title question was a qualified No: like Maritain, Schöningh emphasized that we live in a secular age, in which the Church can and should not hope to wield political power. Christians should certainly not abstain from politics, but they should abstain from the notion that their ideology, or any other, could take the reins of state power. Coming close to the minimalist definition Maritain would announce a few months later, Schöningh defined the political as "the sum of measures which are directed towards the common good in the state and in the communities that build it." We can, he concluded,

---

[143] François Perroux, "Les nations partisanes," *La Fédération* 58 (November 1949), 601-14, here 601, 602 (emphasis in original), 606, 605, 611.

[144] "Individual sketches of 32 Newspapers in the American Zone." Dated 17 January 1947. Information Control Division, Records of the Press Branch [OMGUS], 260/39/42/19/4, Box 212, National Archives, page 8.

collaborate with socialists (Communists are significantly unnamed) insofar as they too are working towards the common good.[145]

The most obvious manifestation of pluralism was the ubiquity of totalitarianism theory, some instances of which were discussed in the section reviewing the Catholic public sphere. While, as Part II of the dissertation demonstrated, totalitarianism theory was originally a Catholic idea, by the late 1940s it had exploded across the European and American public sphere.[146]

One privileged locus of European pluralism was federalism itself, insofar as both theories were based on the overcoming of state sovereignty. Federalism and totalitarianism theory were happy bedfellows in the late 1940s, as Antonin Cohen has pointed out.[147] Each discourse assumed the same historical narrative, one that Catholics had been shoring up for decades: the notion that *sovereignty* was the sinister force lurking behind European catastrophe. The programmatic *Principes du fédéralisme* includes a discussion of left and right totalitarianisms, while Jean Daujat penned a long 1946 article called, "Individualism, Totalitarianism, or Federalism" (he would argue, characteristically, that the first led necessarily to the second, leaving only federalism as the solution). Denis de Rougemont, who was not a Catholic but played an important role in early federalism, announced at a major 1947 conference in Montreux that "there is totalitarianism, and there is federalism. A menace and a hope. This antithesis dominates the century."[148]

---

[145] Franz Josef Schöningh, "Christliche politik?" *Hochland* 41 (1948/9), 305-20, here 310, 313.

[146] Generally, see Gleason, *Totalitarianism*; for a discussion of anti-totalitarianism in German conservatism, see Jean Solchany, "Von Antimodernismus zum Antitotalitarismus: Konservative Interpretationen des Nationalsozialismus in Deutschland, 1945-1949," *Vierteljahresschrift für Zeitgeschichte* 44 (1996), 373-94.

[147] Antonin Cohen, "La Constitution européenne. Ordre politique, utopie juridique et guerre froide," *Critique internationale* 26 (2005), 119-131.

[148] Jean Daujat, "Individualisme, totalitarisme ou fédéralisme," *Cahiers du Monde Nouveau* 2, 2 (February 1946), 1137-54; Denis de Rougemont, "L'Attitude fédéraliste," *La Nef* 4, 35 (Oct 47), 49-60, here 59. For more on this congress, see Vayssière, *Vers une Europe fédérale* 168-70.

Kogon here presents a particularly interesting case. Recall that totalitarianism theory, as we saw in Chapters 4 and 5, arose when it became politically necessary for Catholics to equate Nazism and Bolshevism. For a few hopeful years after the liberation, this did *not* seem necessary, so Kogon shied away from using the theory: totalitarianism theory was not included in the first version of *Der SS-Staat* (1946), as Kogon was still committed to a Germany in which Communists, then enjoying Europe-wide sympathy as prominent resisters, could collaborate with Christians and socialists. By 1948, though, this was no longer in the cards: the joint effects of the Prague coup and the Marshall Plan had convinced him, along with other federalists, that a federalist Europe could only be an Atlantic Europe. In that year, he published "Terror as a System of Power" in *Frankfurter Hefte*, which then appeared in the new edition of *Der SS-Staat* that appeared in 1949. Here, Kogon talks about the "Bolshevik-totalitarian" system and compares it to the Nazi system explored in the book.[149]

Of course it was not only in European federalism that totalitarianism theory enjoyed a new hegemony after 1945: along with federalism, anti-totalitarian pluralism was one of the axes of Catholic rapprochement with the Cold War order. The lectures on which Maritain's *Man and the State* were based were not delivered at the integralist *Institut Catholique*, as his World War I lectures had been. Although the ideas contained were similar, he was now lecturing in the prestigious Walgreen Foundation Lectures at the University of Chicago (alongside Arendt, Schumpeter, Leo Strauss, Voegelin, et al.). Indeed, Maritain had found a congenial home in Chicago, which had, under the leadership of Robert Hutchins, become a key incubator of Cold War social science, and a central conduit between European exiles and America. He had actually been involved with Hutchins & Co. (notably Mortimer Adler and John Nef) since the early 1930s. "It is with great emotion that I think about my next visit to Chicago," he had written to Nef in 1938. "I have a profound sentiment of the great thing that happen there, and to work there under the leadership of President Hutchins […] will

[149] Eugen Kogon, *Der SS-Staat*, 2nd edition (Frankfurt 1949), 2.

be a great joy for me."[150] Maritain's friend, Waldemar Gurian, was part of the Chicago circle, too: he was also friendly with Hutchins, Adler, Morgenthau, and other Chicago figures. Jerome Kerwin and Morgenthau actually attempted to get Gurian hired at Chicago (as was reported in the *Notre Dame Scholastic*, Gurian's *Review of Politics* had more readers at Chicago than at Notre Dame).[151]

Chicago was one of the central loci of transnational Cold War political thought, but it was not alone in its anti-modernism and congeniality to Catholicism. The Cold War version of democracy was decidedly not the "totalitarian democracy" of Rousseau, in which the atomized crowds, produced by modernity, could steer the state towards violence. It was the more subdued democracy of Tocqueville: a democracy that could, through political pluralism, actively forestall the atomizing effects of modernization through religion and civil society.[152] "The dominant reading of power in mid-twentieth-century America," Dan Rodgers reports, was "interest-group pluralism."[153] As Edward Purcell has demonstrated, theorists of American democracy, in response to the rise of "totalitarianism," theorized an open-ended democratic experiment, built around interest-group pluralism, the politics of consensus, and general ideological inclusiveness (this would reach its apogee in the work of Robert Dahl). As a Rockefeller Foundation report would later argue, "the

[150] Jacques Maritain to John Nef, 22 April 1938, Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim.

[151] Jerome Kerwin to Waldemar Gurian, 15 January 1946, Gurian Papers, Box 4, Folder 21; Lawrence Connor, "The Review of Politics", *Notre Dame Scholastic* 90, 1 (5 November 1948), 17-18.

[152] In my account of interwar critiques of mass society, it may have struck readers that Tocqueville had said the same thing decades before. This becomes the exception that proves the rule, insofar as Tocqueville was essentially forgotten between until the late 1930s, and had to wait until the 1940s for a proper renaissance.

[153] Dan Rodgers, *Age of Fracture* (Cambridge, MA, 2011), 81. For traditions of pluralism in American political thought and its critique by the New Left, see, among others, Darryl Baskin, "American Pluralism: Theory, Practice, and Ideology," *Journal of Politics* 32 (1970), 71-95; Nils Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future*; Edward Purcell, *The Crisis of Democratic Theory* (Lexington, 1973). For a highly suggestive account of the ways in which all of this impacted American constitutional law, see Richard Primus, "A Brooding Omnipresence: Totalitarianism in Postwar Constitutional Thought," *The Yale Law Journal* 106 (1996), 423-57.

effort to impose unity of belief in matters of religion and ultimate philosophy, far from unifying a society, can lead to extraordinary bloodshed and brutality."[154]

Isaiah Berlin's value pluralism found its analogue in a social theory of pluralism that became important to Cold War social science in both Europe and America; both versions of the theory were founded in the same suspicion of centralized power. "Liberalism is a system of pluralism," Edward Shils announced. "It is a system of many centers of power, many areas of privacy and a strong internal impulse toward the mutual adaptation of the spheres rather than of the dominance or the submission of any one to the others." Raymond Aron refers to "[d]emocratic societies, which I prefer to call pluralistic societies."[155] Socialists, too, began to make pluralistic arguments: Ernst Fraenkel is the most famous figure in this regard.[156]

These social scientists theorized a democracy congenial to the Catholic imagination (Maritain came to celebrate Tocqueville in particular), and in fact a form of democracy for which Catholics had long been calling. Maritain, who drew liberally on Tocqueville for his political theory, is the most obvious example: his *Integral Humanism*, as we saw in Chapter 4, called for a "personalist" democracy. This was not as revolutionary as normally thought: as we have seen elsewhere, various Catholic reactionaries had stated in the 1920s, following Leo XIII's line in *Immortale Dei*, that the form of government was irrelevant. They had simply claimed that democracy, as it existed at the time, was incompatible with Catholicism. This changed, however: when democracies understood themselves to be pluralist—when their logic could be dislodged from the secular logic of étatisme—Catholics could believe in and support their legitimacy.

---

[154] Quoted on Purcell, *Crisis of Democratic Theory* 238 (this manifesto, which was supported by such Cold War luminaries as Henry Luce, appeared in 1960).

[155] Quoted Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future* 19, 49.

[156] On Fraenkel and the SPD in this regard, see Udi Greenberg's forthcoming *Cold War Weimar: German Emigré Intellectuals and the Weimar Origins of the Cold War*; Uwe Backes, "Vom Marxismus zum Antitotalitrismus: Ernst Fraenkel und Richard Löwenthal," in *Totalitarismuskritik von links*, 327-354.

Atlantic Catholicism (III): Waldemar Gurian and America

We return at last to Waldemar Gurian, who has been, in a way, the beating heart of this dissertation. A refugee from Soviet Russia to Nazi Germany to Cold War America: if the spirit of world history travels from nation to nation, as Hegel theorized, Gurian was one of those doomed to be dragged in its wake. But while he had been a harsh critic of Bolshevism and Nazism, and was the first to join the two under the rubric of "totalitarianism," he had no such harsh words for his final home. Like many other Catholics, both in America and abroad, Gurian became enamored with America, both as a force for good in European politics and as a model of a religious path to modernity. His friend, Jacques Maritain, told Georges Bidault that one of the main reasons he wanted to give up his post at the Vatican was to return to America and further Franco-American friendship; "I love America," Maritain wrote to Mortimer Adler in 1940, "and I think that it is, aside from France, the only country in which I could live."[157] And while Gurian had, in the Weimar period, seen capitalism and America as modern pathologies, to be overcome by a religious renaissance and a new form of Christendom, by the late 1940s he was one of America's most persistent Catholic champions, and his journal, the *Review of Politics*, a central locus of Cold War social science.[158] He spoke at Hutchins's University of Chicago on the virtues of the Marshall Plan.[159] He brought his new love for America back to Europe, speaking at the *Amerika-Häuser* set up by OMGUS and writing in German newspapers, both Catholic and secular, on American foreign policy; he also wrote for *Der Monat* (Germany's CCF organ) and lectured on Bolshevism in

[157] Jacques Maritain to Georges Bidault, 25 August 1947; Jacques Maritain to Mortimer Adler, December 1940, Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim.

[158] Wilhelm Cornides's belief that the *Review of Politics* was a continuation of Weimar-era *Hochland* confirms the continuity thesis I present here. Rudolf Carnap thought the same thing, incidentally, but criticized Gurian for hiding the obvious Catholic sources of the journal's articles, even the ostensibly secular ones. Cornides to Waldemar Gurian, 29 December 1948, Gurian Papers, Box 2, Folder 14; Carnap to Gurian, 2 June 1945, Gurian Papers, Box 2, Folder 13.

[159] This is described in Notre Dame's press release: PNDP PR 47-206 (17 July 1947); these are available in the reading room of the Notre Dame Archives.

Austria.[160] By 1950, writing in *Rheinischer Merkur*, Gurian could claim that the United States "is not too imperialist, on the contrary, it is not imperialist enough."[161]

The place of America in postwar Europe, and the extent to which its history can be described as "Americanization," has occasioned intense debate. Nonetheless, a rough consensus has formed that, as Mary Nolan reports, "everywhere in western Europe hegemonic America was the model of modernity with which Europeans had to deal."[162] This was true politically, as well: the Americans had an obvious role in setting up the new West German state, whereas the Americans were, as Irwin Wall has shown, deeply involved in French politics.[163] While these debates will be in the background of this chapter, I will be more interested in thinking about the image of "America" in the Catholic public sphere, and the ways in which appreciation for American culture lubricated Catholic acceptance of the political and culture shape of the new Western Europe. Whereas interwar Catholics had, with few exceptions, seen America as the mechanical menace to be avoided at all costs, postwar Catholics—responding, of course, to the more general enthusiasm for American dollars, consumer goods, and films—largely felt otherwise. While there were certainly pockets of anti-Americanism, these were marginal. As a whole, the Catholic public sphere came to accept America. Or, at least, the image of America that was prevalent at the time: an unstable mixture of social reality, American self-presentation, and European projection. Catholics imagined themselves to be part of a "West" that expanded to America: Ernst von Hippel, a prominent postwar federalist

---

[160] Waldemar Gurian, "Drei Korrespondenten über Deutschland," *Der Monat* (1950), 546-8. The program for the Salzburg lectures is contained in an 18 March 1949 letter from W. Reinermann, Gurian Papers, Box 17, Folder 11. Hildebrand and Kogon spoke at the same series, incidentally.

[161] Waldemar Gurian, "Die Weltpolitik der USA," *Rheinischer Merkur* 5, 37 (9 Sept 1950), 5.

[162] Mary Nolan, "Gender and Utopian Visions in a Post-Utopian Era: Americanism, Human Rights, Market Fundamentalism," *Central European History* 44 (2011), 13-36, here 16. For an insightful and still-illuminating account, see Charles Maier, "The Politics of Productivity: Foundations of American International Economic Policy after World War II," *International Organization* 31 (1977), 607-33.

[163] Wall, *The United States and the Making of Postwar France, 1945-1954*

and jurist, described the "Euro-American cultural circle" in a 1946 article: a conjunction that would have been unthinkable earlier (especially in the 1930s, when Hippel had prolifically published under the Nazi regime).[164] "The attitude of the United States," Fessard wrote in 1950, "attempting to restore their power and that of the West [Occident], seems to me largely reasonable."[165] "As a matter of fact," Maritain announced in a 1952 speech, "the Atlantic is now becoming that which the Mediterranean was for thirty centuries—the domestic sea of Western civilization."[166]

The Americans went out of their way to legitimate this interpretation, which was clearly in their national interest. This was especially true in Germany, where America had the clearest impact on European reconstruction. OMGUS officials, like Americans at home, went out of their way to speak the language of Catholicism: "The true reform of the German people will come from within. It will be spiritual and moral," declared a prominent OMGUS official at Berchtesgaden in 1948; he went on to refine "the so-called German problem" into "a European problem and a part of the moral collapse of civilization."[167] The occupying authorities did all they could to help the church. OMGUS, despite the reservations of some of its officials, did all it could to portray a Resistance Church, whose universal values of freedom had kept it from succumbing to fascism. "The church emerged from the catacombs of physical ruin and spiritual disorder," reads one internal report, as "(1) the only voice that had consistently been raised in opposition to the excesses of Nazism, (2) the strongest source of order in the early days of the occupation, and (3) almost the only remaining

---

[164] Ernst von Hippel, "Reform des rechtswissenschaftlichen Studiums," *Neues Abendland* 1, 7 (Sept 1946), 2-6, here 5.

[165] Gaston Fessard to Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster, 11 February 1950, Fonds Fessard, Box 51, Folder E/F.

[166] This is from Maritain's speech at the Waldorf in New York, celebrating his friend Mortimer Adler's Great Books Project. Enclosed in a 17 April 1952 letter from Adler to Maritain, Maritain Archives, Kolbsheim.

[167] Alonzo Grace [Director, Education and Cultural Relations Division, OMGUS], "Out of the Rubble: An Address on the Reorientation of the German People," delivered in Berchtesgaden in October 1948. Religious Affairs Branch, 615 (A1), General Records, 1946-9, 390/46/15-16/5-4, National Archives, Box 158, Folder 6, page 3. For a recent, broader account of these phenomena, see Jason W. Stevens, *God-Fearing and Free.*

organization touching a majority of the people."[168] They were responding, perhaps, to Soviet provocation: whether true or not, internal documents indicate that OMGUS was under the impression that Communists were attempting "to discredit leading church personalities in the eyes of the Americans."[169]

The center of the OMGUS effort was the Cultural and Religious Affairs Branch, which agitated within OMGUS for the centrality of the Churches to postwar strategy. Marshall Knappen, a political scientist from the University of Chicago and former priest, spoke for many in this division (of which he was Chief) when he declared Nazism and Christianity to be "theoretically incompatible."[170] Their intervention, for instance, ensured that the Churches would not be classed as cultural organizations, and thus be spared the indignities of licensing and oversight: this was done, explains one of the leaders of the branch, so that "the Churches might carry out their mission as the spiritual foundation of the new democracy."[171] They put on exhibitions about the resisting church (both Catholic and Protestant), for instance, and released precious paper supplies to collections of documents purporting to show that the Church had been, behind the scenes, a stalwart opponent of Nazism. Perhaps the extent of OMGUS's infatuation with the Church can best be seen from the viewpoint of a minority: the socialist Arthur Eggleston, chief of the Press Control Branch. "So many MG [Military Government] officers are over-awed by holy office," he lamented. They "allow religion to influence their political thinking, [and] are over-inclined to favor the clergy as against any other

---

[168] Report on the U.S.Occupation of Germany, Religious Affairs Program, 23 September 1947, Box 165, Folder 3, Religious Affairs Branch, 615 (A1), General Records, 1946-9, 390/46/15-16/5-4, National Archives, pages 1-2.

[169] MG Weekly Intelligence Report for Württemberg-Baden (n.d., between 1945 and 1948), Box 202, Folder 23, Records Relating to the Cutlural Exchange Programs of the Catholic Affairs Section, 1946-1950. 260/390/46/16-/4-

[170] Marshall Knappen, "The Christian Churches in Germany," February 1946, Religious Affairs Branch, 615 (A1), General Records, 1946-9, 390/46/15-16/5-4, National Archives, Box 158, Folder 7, page 3.

[171] Incomplete essay by Eagan. C. June 1947, Religious Affairs Branch, 615 (A1), General Records, 1946-9, 390/46/15-16/5-4, National Archives, Box 158, Folder 6, page 8.

group of citizens."[172] Eggleston argued that the Church was full of reactionaries and had been a happy collaborator with National Socialism: ironically, at least one official in the Cultural and Religious Affairs divisions seems to have agreed with him. "History must be re-written," he announced in a 1948 radio address, "so as to emphasize the long and difficult struggle for tolerance."[173]

The Americans were also extremely interested in bringing Europeans to America so that they could see their pious democracy firsthand (we have already seen their hosting of Paul-Henri Spaak and, through the Rockefeller Foundation, Eugen Kogon).[174] In April 1949, Urban Fleege reported, there were "40 German Catholic experts who are leaders of various Catholic organizations observing religious activities in the United States."[175] These efforts paid off: Cardinal von Preysing visited America in February 1947 and, two months later, reported to his flock, "It will be a consolation and encouragement for you to learn that our holy church over there is prospering. […] The Catholic schools in America have impressed me deeply. It is a wonderful system."[176] Paul Bolkovac, who visited for six months, wrote a long travelogue for *Stimmen der Zeit*, reporting on the strength of the Church in small town America.[177] This appreciation for America as a civilization was

---

[172] Untitled memo by Arthur Eggleston, Policy Adviser, Information Control Division, HQ, US Forces European Theater (dated 14 November 1945), Box 244, Folder 57, OMGUS, Records of the Office of Military Government, Bavaria, Records of the Intelligence Division, 260/39/41/17/7, National Archives.

[173] James Eagan,"Introuction: Council of Christians and Jews," broadcast over AFN, Munich, 22 August 1948, Box 165, Folder 3, Religious Affairs Branch, 615 (A1), General Records, 1946-9, 390/46/15-16/5-4, National Archives, page 3.

[174] On this policy in general, see Axel Schildt, "Sind die Westdeutschen amerikanisiert worden?", *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 50 (2000), 3-19, here 7.

[175] Urban Fleege to Bernhard Schad, 26 April 1949, Religious Affairs Branch, 615 (A1), General Records, 1946-9, 390/46/15-16/5-4, National Archives, Box 153, Folder 19.

[176] I am relying here on a translation prepared by OMGUS of an article that appeared in *Petrusblatt* on 6 April 1947, Religious Affairs Branch, 615 (A1), General Records, 1946-9, 390/46/15-16/5-4, National Archives, Box 186, Folder 18.

[177] Paul Bolkovac, "Ein halbes Jahr in USA," *Stimmen der Zeit* 145 (1949-50), 25-38. For similar essays, see Rudolph Edward M. Morris, "Le catholicisme aux États-Unis," *Dieu Vivant* 3 (1945), 103-114; P. Denoyer, "La vie catholique aux États-Unis," *La Vie Intellectuelle* 13, 11 (December 1945), 43-9.

matched by appreciation for its ideas: we have already seen Jean Lorraine's suggestion, in *La Fédération*, that Europe must choose between the spirit of Lincoln and that of Lenin. Josef Hoffmann, in an essay on personalism and democracy, compared the American Revolution favorably with its French successor, lauding the "wisdom" of the founding fathers, who knew to avoid absolute democracy by setting up a network of institutions between the unruly masses and the levers of power.[178] It was especially common to see American federalism as a possible model for Europe's own future.[179]

To fully understand the Catholic appreciation for America—to understand a world in which a German Catholic exile could write to a bishop that "I am now beginning to feel thoroughly at home in American literature"[180]—we must turn to changes in American social thought. "Anti-totalitarianism" and "pluralism," in addition to being theories with their own conceptual trajectories, were nourished by a widespread sense that the rationalist, enlightenment project and its attendant social engineering had failed (a *Partisan Review* series called this a "Failure of Nerve"). Although the intellectual history of the late 1940s and 1950s is in its infancy, it seems clear that intellectuals across America and Western Europe became convinced of the limited capacities of reason to reorder society, or even to fully understand it.[181] There were, of course, radical versions of this theory afoot: Adorno, Horkheimer, Heidegger, Strauss, and others, in a move that has become familiar (Agamben,

---

[178] Josef Hofmann, "Sicherung und Gefährdung der Person in der Demokratie," *Die Neue Ordnung* 1 (1946/7), 171-80, here 172, 174.

[179] Wilhelm Henle, "Die Struktur des amerikanischen Föderalismus," *Neues Abendland* 6, 9 (Sept 51), 486-92; R. Silva, "Le Fédéralisme américain," *Cahiers du Monde Nouveau* 2, 2 (February 1946), 1171-92. It was even argued, from a non-Catholic perspective, that the Americans essentially invented federalism, and that the word itself had been coined by George Washington. Bodo Dennewitz, *Der Föderalismus* (1947), 23.

[180] H.A. Reinhold to Bishop Bernin, n.d. [1946]. A copy of this is in Gurian Papers, Box 6, Folder 24,.

[181] For a joint biography of Whittaker Chambers and Lionel Trilling making essentially this point, see Michael Kimmage, *The Conservative Turn* (Cambridge, MA, 2009). Chambers, of course, turned to religion himself, while Trilling, like his friend Isaiah Berlin, turned to a form of liberal skepticism that was at least alive, and at most sympathetic, to the claims of religion.

Bauman …), blamed the European catastrophe on the "modern project," however understood, as such.[182] These figures remained, at least for the time being, on the margins: they did, though, radicalize a suspicion of Enlightenment that was becoming widespread in the late 1940s. This had not happened after World War I to a comparable degree: the jackboots and spiked helmets of the Prussians could readily be ascribed to an exhausted and decadent past, to be overcome by an enlightened future. Although there were obviously rumblings of discontent, hegemonic political discourse had remained celebratory of the modern project. The utopian hopes of the Wilsonian moment—more widespread and historically significant than the paeans to decadence and exhaustion cropping up in *The Dial* or *Dada*—were essentially in line with the Kantian cosmopolitanism of nineteenth-century liberalism. The Hun of the post-WWI liberal imaginary was marked by his atavism, and not his modernity.[183]

Nazism was understood differently: its most important early interpreters saw something intrinsically modern in the Nazi project. They drew upon a cluster of post-Weberean developments of sociology (Mannheim, Ortega y Gasset, Frankfurt School) that criticized modern societies for its "mass" basis, for its tendency to pulverize political groupings in the name of individualism. This was, of course, true of Catholics, who had been saying so since at least 1932: one of the central features of Catholic totalitarianism theory, recall, was that both Nazism and Communism were rooted in the failures of the Enlightenment project. But whereas Gurian in 1932 had been speaking to a small circle of co-religionists, Catholics by the late 1940s had a more important platform. Eugen Kogon and Max Picard were read, it seems, by everyone. They were now joined by many others across the Euro-American public sphere who believed that liberal capitalism's dislocations and

[182] Anson Rabinbach, *In the Shadow of Catastrophe*, Part II (Berkeley, 1997).

[183] For some examples (depicting Prussians as pigs and gorillas, and more generally as evolutionarily debased), see Waldemar Zacharesiewicz, *Images of Germany in American Literature* (Iowa City, 2007), 80-89.

Vermassung were at the root of totalitarianism: Hannah Arendt, Raymond Aron, Carl Friedrich, Karl Löwith, Franz Neumann, Eric Voegelin, Alfred Weber, and more converged on some version of this thesis.

This was part of a more widespread suspicion of Enlightenment modernity: Ze'ev Sternhell has referred to "The Anti-Enlightenment of the Cold War."[184] While the phrasing is provocative, Sternhell refers to the familiar Cold War skepticism of rationality and liberal theories of progress, the familiar Cold War invocation of the "dark side" of human and political nature, the twin realisms of Niebuhr and Morgenthau, the putatively adult understandings of inevitable conflict and tragedy.[185] This is not "anti-Enlightenment" in the radical sense of the *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, but suspicion of modernity in a softer key: the familiar invocation of family values and robust civil society as necessary corrective to social engineering. Certain figures—Burke, Tocqueville—were revived as distinguished forebears of this political maturity, while others—Rousseau above all—were pilloried as theorists and harbingers of "totalitarian democracy." In his consideration of American social sciences of the 1940s and 1950s, Ira Katznelson demonstrates the widespread nature of the belief "that a simple reassertion of liberal modernism had become radically insufficient."[186] Richard Crossman, in his preface to one of the central texts of the period's intellectual history, explains that

> [t]he intellectual attraction of Marxism was that it exploded liberal fallacies—which really were fallacies. It taught the bitter truth that progress is not automatic, that boom and slump are inherent in capitalism, that social injustice and racial discrimination are not cured merely by the passage of time.[187]

---

[184] Sternhell, *The Anti-Enlightenment Tradition*, Chapter 8.

[185] For a discussion of the similarities of Maritain and Niebuhr on the issue of political pluralism, see John W. Cooper, "Democratic Pluralism and Human Rights: The Political Theologies of Jacques Maritain and Reinhold Niebuhr," *Jacques Maritain, philosophe dans la cité*, ed. Jen-Louis Allard (Ottawa, 1985), 327-36.

[186] Ira Katznelson, *Desolation and Enlightenment*, 19.

[187] *The God that Failed*, ed. Richard Crossman (New York, 1949), 5.

The "God that Failed," of course, was Communism, and no God arose to take its place—not even liberalism. The post-ideological, pluralist state had no room for state religion, or for a God at its helm. But it was not, for that reason, secular. As Christians had claimed for centuries, and as was historically true in the 1940s, the absence of God can be a trace of his unmistakable presence.

Bibliography

Archival Collections

Archives of the Centre d'Etudes Jacques et Raïssa Maritain, Kolbsheim, France

Collections: Jacques Maritain

Archives Jésuites, Vanves

Collections: Fonds Gaston Fessard

Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München

Collections: Nachlaß Dietrich von Hildebrand (Ana544), Nachlaß Karl Muth (Ana390), Nachlaß Max Scheler (Ana315)

Bibliothèque Nationale Française, Paris

Collections: Fonds Stanislas Fumet (NAF28071); Fonds Henri Massis (NAF25257)

Dwight D. Eisenhower Library, Abilene, Kansas

Collections: Walter Bedell Smith Papers

Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Bonn

Collections: Nachlaß Walter Dirks, Kogon Sammlung Personalia

Historical Archives of the European Union, European Institute, Florence.

Collections: Union of European Federalists [UEF], Fonds Alexandre Marc

Institut für Zeitgeschichte, München

Collections: Nachlaß Karl Thieme

Jacques Maritain Center, University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Indiana

Collections: Jacques Maritain Archives

Landesarchiv Nordrhein-Westfalen Hauptstaatsarchiv Düsseldorf

Collections: Nachlaß Carl Schmitt

Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Collections: Waldemar Gurian

National Archives, College Park, Maryland

Collections: OMGUS, Religious Affairs Branch, (615 (A1), General Records, 1946-9, 390/46/15-16/5-4); OMGUS, Records Relating to the Cultural Exchange Programs of the Catholic Affairs Section, 1946-1950 (260/390/46/16-/4); OMGUS, Information Control Division, Records of the Press Branch (260/390/42/19/); OMGUS, Records of the Office of Military Government, Bavaria, Records of the Intelligence Division (260/39/41/17/7)

Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey

Collections: John Oesterreicher Archives [SHU RG 26.4.1]

University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Indiana

Collections: Waldemar Gurian [ZAN]; George Shuster [CSHU]

Newspapers and Periodicals

1934

Abendland

L'Action Française

Allgemeine Rundschau

Cahiers

Cahiers du Monde Nouveau

Christliche Ständestaat

Civilisation

Combat

Commonweal

Courrier Royal

Credo

La Croix

Deutsh-Französische Rundschau

Documents

L'Echo de Paris

Économie et Humanisme

Esprit

Les Documents

Ende und Anfang

Etudes

Europäische Revue

La Fédération

La France Catholique

Frankfurter Hefte

La Gazette française

Germania

Der Gral

Die Heilige Feuer

Hochland

Idées

L'Insurgé

Le Mouvement Social

Das Neue Reich

Neues Abendland

Réaction pour l'ordre

La Revue Fédéraliste

Review of Politics

Revue du Xxème Siècle

Revue française

Revue des Jeunes

Revue du Siècle

Revue Universelle

Rhein-Mainische Volkszeitung

Rheinischer Merkur

Die Schildgenossen

Schönere Zukunft

Schweizerische Rundschau

Sept

Stimmen der Zeit

Süddeutsche Zeitung

Témoignage chrétien

Temps présent

La Vie Catholique

La Vie Intellectuelle

La Vie Spirituelle

Die Zukunft

Selected Primary Sources

Annales de la Chambre des Députés. Paris, 1904.

Communisme et les chrétiens. Paris, 1937.

Katholische-soziales Manifest. Ed. Studienrunde katholischer Soziologen. Mainz, 1932.

Ordre social et éducation. Semaines Sociales de France, XXVIème session. Nice, 1934.

L'organisation corporative. Semaines Sociales de France, XXVIIème session. Angers, 1935.

Die Österreichische Aktion. Vienna, 1927.

La personne humaine en peril. Semaines Sociales de France, XXIXème session. Lyon, 1938.

La politique républicaine. Paris, 1924.

Pour le Bien Commun. Paris, 1934.

Le role économique de l'état. Semaines Sociales de France, XIVème session. Lyon, 1922.

Semaine Sociale de France, IIIème session. Lyon, 1906.

Les scouts de France, principes, status, règlement intérieur, 2nd edition. Paris, 1923.

La société politique et la pensée chrétienne. Semaines Sociales de France, XXVème session. Lyon, 1934.

Agathon [i.e. Massis and de Tarde]. *Les jeunes gens d'aujourd'hui*, ed. Jean-Jacques Becker. Paris, 1995.

Paul Archambault, ed. *La Cité moderne et les Transformations du Droit*, Paris, 1925.

Barrès, Maurice. *La Génie du Rhin*. Paris, 1921.

Brauer, Theodor. *Der Katholik im neuen Reich*. München, 1933.

--. *Gewerkschaft und Volkswirtschaft*. Jena, 1922.

--. *Krisis der Gewerkschaften*. Jena, 1924.

Belliot, Albéric. *Manuel de sociologie catholique*. Paris, 1927.

Boncour, Joseph-Paul et Charles Maurras. *La République et la Décentralisation*. Paris, 1923.

Bouvier-Ajam, Maurice. *La doctrine corporative*. 5th edition. Paris, 1943.

Bowen, Ralph. *German Theories of the Corporative State*. New York, 1947.

Cochin, Augustin. *La Crise de l'histoire révolutionnaire*. Paris, 1909.

--. *La Révolution et la Libre-Pensée*. Paris, 1924.

Daudet, Léon. *Memoirs*, ed. and trans. Arthur Griggs. New York, 1925.

Deploige, Simon. *Le conflit de la morale et de la sociologie.* Paris, 1912.

Deschanel, Paul, Jean Jaurès, and André Ribot, *Le budget et la politique étrangère de la France: Discours prononcés à la Chambre des Députés du 19 au 29 janvier 1903*. Paris, 1903.

Fessard, Gaston. *Le communisme va-t-il dans le sens de l'histoire.* Paris, 1949.

--. *La Main Tendue.* Paris, 1937.

--. *Pax Nostra.* Paris, 1936.

Francis, Robert, Thierry-Maulnier, Jean-Pierre Maxence, *Demain la France.* Paris, 1934.

Franzel, Emil. *Gegen den Wind der Zeit.* Munich, 1983.

Garaudy, Roger. *L'Eglise, le Communisme et les Chrétiens*. Paris, 1949.

Garrigou-Lagrange, Réginald. *Le Sens Commun.* Paris, 1909, 1922.

Gleason, Abbot. *Totalitarianism*. New York, 1995.

Gurian, Waldemar. *Bolshevism*. Trans. E.I. Watkin. New York, 1931.

Gurian, Waldemar [as Stefan Kirchmann]. *St. Ambrosius und die deutschen Bischöfe*. Luzern, 1934.

Gurian, Waldemar [as Walter Gerhart]. *Um des Reiches Zukunft.* Freiburg, 1932.

Hildebrand, Dietrich von. *Memoiren und Aufsätze gegen den Nationalsozialismus, 1933-1938*. Ed Ernst Wenisch. Mainz, 1994.

Kogon, Eugen. *Dieses merkwürdige, wichtige Leben*. Ed. Michael Kogon. Berlin, 1997. .

--. *Die Idee des christlichen Ständestaats*. Berlin, 2000.

Landsberg, Paul-Ludwig. *Die Welt des Mittelalter und Wir.* Bonn, 1923.

--, *Problèmes du personnalisme.* Paris, 1952.

Lucius, Pierre. *Révolutions du Xxème Siècle.* Paris, 1934.

Lugmayer, Karl. *Das Linzer Programm der christlichen Arbeiter Österreichs.* Vienna, 1924.

Maritain, Jacques. *Christianity and Democracy*. Trans. Doris Ansen. New York, 1944.

--. *Humanisme intégral.* Paris, 1939.

--. *Man and the State.* Chicago, 1951.

--. *Oeuvres Complètes*, ed. Cercle d'études Jacques et Raïssa Maritain. Fribourg, 1982-99.

--. *Three Reformers.* Westport, 1970

Massis, Henri. *Defense of the West.* Trans. F.S. Flint. New York, 1928.

Maurras, Charles. *L'Avenir de l'Intelligence.* Paris, 1905.

--. *Quand les français ne s'aimaient pas.* Paris, 1916

--. *Romantisme et Révolution.* Paris, 1923.

Michel, Ernst. *Politik aus dem Glauben.* Jena, 1926.

Oesterreicher, John. *Walls are Crumbling.* New York, 1952.

Perroux, François. *Capitalisme et communauté de travail.* Paris, 1938.

--. *Les mythes hitlériens.* Lyon, 1935.

Pesch, Heinrich. *Lehrbuch der Nationalökonomie,* Bd. 1. Freiburg, 1905.

Platz, Hermann. *Deutschland-Frankreich und die Idee des Abendlandes.* Köln, 1924.

Reynold, Gonzague de. *Portugal.* Paris, 1936.

Ritter, Emil. Ed. *Katholisch-konservatives Erbgut.* Freiburg, 1934.

Röpke, Wilhelm. *Civitas Humana.* Zürich, 1944.

--. *Internationale Ordnung.* Zürich, 1945.

Rougier, Louis. *La scolastique et le thomisme.* Paris, 1925.

--. *Les mystiques économiques*, 2nd edition. Paris, 1949.

Rüstow, Alexander. *Das Versagen des Wirtschaftsliberalismus als religionsgeschichtliches problem.* Istanbul, 1945.

Scheler, Max. *Politisch-Pädagogische Schriften*, ed. Manfred Frings. München, 1982.

--, *On the Eternal in Man*, trans. Bernard Noble. Hamden, Conn., 1972.

Schmitt, Carl. *Political Romanticism*. Trans. Guy Oakes. Cambridge, 1986.

--, *Die Rheinlande als Objekt internationaler Politik*. Köln, 1925.

--, *Roman Catholicism and Political* Form, trans. G.L. Ulmen. Westport, 1996.

Thieme, Karl. *Deutsche evangelische Christen auf dem Wege zur katholischen Kirche*. Züirch, 1934.

Tischleder, Peter. *Staatsgewalt und katholisches Gewissen*. Frankfurt, 1927.

--. *Der Staat*. Mönchengladbach, 1926.

Villey, Daniel. *Redevenir les hommes libres*. Paris, 1946.

Selected Secondary Sources

Agócs, Sándor. "'Germania Doceat!' The Volksverein, the Model for Italian Catholic Action, 1905-1914," *Catholic Historical Review* (61) 1975. 31-47.

Anderson, Margaret. "Piety and Politics: Recent Work on German Catholicism," *Journal of Modern History* 63 (1991). 681-716.

Auzépy-Chavagnac, Véronique. *Jean de Fabrègues et la Jeune Droite catholique*. Pas-de-calais, 2002.

Barré, Jacques. *Jacques and Raïssa Maritain*, trans. Bernard Doering. South Bend, 2005.

Beale, Marjorie. *The Modernist Enterprise*. Stanford, 1999.

Becker, Annette. *War and Faith*. Oxford, 1980.

Becker, Jean-Jacques. *Les Français dans la Grande Guerre*. Paris, 1980.

Besier, Gerhard and Francesca Piombo. *The Holy See and Hitler's Germany*. Trans. W.R. Ward. New York, 2007.

Blessing, Werner K. *Staat und Kirche in der Gesellschaft*. Göttingen, 1982.

Boyer, John. *Culture and Political Crisis in Vienna*. Chicago, 1995.

Brenner, Neil. *New State Spaces*. New York, 2004

Brelie-Lewien, Doris von der. *Katholische Zeitschriften in den Westzonen, 1945-9*. Frankfurt, 1986.

Breuning, Klaus. *Die Vision des Reiches*. Munich, 1969.

Brick, Howard. *Transcending Capitalism*. Ithaca, 2006.

Buchanan, Tom and Martin Conway, eds. *Political Catholicism in Europe, 1918-1965*. Oxford, 1996.

Cary, Noel. *The Path to Christian Democracy*. Cambridge, MA, 1996.

Chadwick, Kay, ed. *Catholicism, Politics, and Society in Twentieth-Century France*. Liverpool, 2000.

Chaunu, Jean. *Esquisse d'un jugement chrétien du nazisme*. Paris, 2007.

Chenaux, Philippe. *De la chrétienté à l'Europe*. Paris, 2007.

--. *Entre Maurras et Maritain*. Paris, 1999.

Cholvy, Gerard and Yves-Marie Hilaire*, Histoire religieuse de la France contemporaine*. Tolouse, 1985-1988.

Cohen, Antonin. "La Constitution européenne: Ordre politique, utopie juridique et guerre froide." *Critique internationale* (26) 2005. 119-131.

Connelly, John. "Catholic Racism and Its Opponents." *Journal of Modern History* (79) 2007. 813-847.

Conway, Martin and Peter Romijn, eds. *The War on Legitimacy in Politics and Culture, 1936-1946*. New York, 2008.

Conway, Martin. "Building the Christian City: Catholics and Politics in Interwar Francophone Belgium," *Past and Present* (128), 1990. 117-51.

--, *Catholic Politics in Europe, 1918-1945*. London, 1997.

--. "Democracy in Postwar Western Europe: The Triumph of a Political model." *European History Quarterly* (32) 2002. 59-84.

--, "The Rise and Fall of Western Europe's Democratic Age, 1945-73," *Contemporary European History* (13) 2004. 67-88.

Conze, Vanessa. *Das Europe der Deutschen*. Munich, 2005.

Coppa, Frank. *The Modern Papacy since 1789*. New York, 1998.

Corrin, Jay. *Catholic Intellectuals and the Challenge of Democracy*. Notre Dame, 2002.

Delbreil, Jean-Claude. *Les catholiques française et les tentatives de rapprochement franco-allemand (1920-1933*). Metz, 1972.

Diamant*,* Alfred. *Austrian Catholics and the First Republic*. Princeton, 1960.

Downs, Laura Lee. "'Each and every one of you must become a *chef*': Toward a Social Politics of Working-Class Childhood on the Extreme Right in 1930s France." *Journal of Modern History* (81) 2009. 1-44.

Durand, Jean-Dominique. *L'Europe de la Démocratie chrétienne.* Paris, 1995.

Durand, Jean-Dominique, et al., eds. *Cent ans de catholicisme social à Lyeon et en Rhône-Alps*. Paris, 1992.

Ebneth, Rudolf. *Die österreichische Wochenschrift* Der Christliche Ständestaat*, deutsche Emigration in Österreich 1933-1938*. Mainz, 1976.

Eichengreen, Barry. *European Economy Since 1945*. Princeton, 2007.

Elwitt, Sanford. *The Third Republic Defended.* Baton Rouge, 1986.

Evans, Ellen L. *The Cross and the Ballot.* Boston, 1999.

Foureau, Christine. *La revue universelle. 1920-1940*. Ph.D. dissertation. Princeton University, 1999.

Gellott, Laura. "Defending Catholic Interests in the Christian State: The Role of Catholic Action in Austria, 1933-1938." *Catholic Historical Review* (74) 1988. 571-89.

Geyer, Michael, and Hartmutt Lehmann. *Religion und Nation, Nation und Religion.* Göttingen, 2005.

Gilman, Nils. *Mandarins of the Future.* Baltimore, 2003.

Gruber, Helmut. "Sexuality in 'Red Vienna': Socialist Party Conceptions and Programs and

Working-Clas Life, 1920-1934," *International Labor and Working-Class History* (31) 1987. 37-68.

Grunewald, Michel and Uwe Punschner, eds. *Le Milieu Intellectuel Catholique en Allemagne, sa Presse et Ses Réseaux (1871-1963)*. Berne, 2006.

Hastings, Derek. "How 'Catholic' Was the Early Nazi Movement? Religion, Race and Culture in Munich, 1919-24." *Central European History* (36) 2003. 383-433.

Heilbronner, Oded. "From Ghetto to Ghetto: The Place of German Catholic Society in Recent Historiography." *Journal of Modern History* (72) 2000. 453-95.

Hellman, John. *The Communitarian Third Way.* Montreal, 2002.

Herzog, Dagmar. *Sex after Fascism.* Princeton, 2007.

Hong, Young-Sun. *Welfare, Modernity, and the Weimar State, 1919-1933*. Princeton, 1998.

Hürten, Heinz. *Deutsche Katholiken, 1918-1945.* Paderborn, 1992.

--, *Waldmar Gurian*. Mainz, 1972.

Inboden, William. *Religion and American Foreign Policy, 1945-60*. New York, 2008.

Kaiser, Wolfram. *Christian Democracy and the Origins of European Union.* New York, 2007.

Kaiser, Wolfram and Helmut Wohnout, eds. *Political Catholicism in Europe, 1919-1945*. London, 2004.

Kalyvas, Stathis. *The Rise of Christian Democracy in Europe*. Ithaca, 1996.

Katzenstein, Peter J. *Policy and Politics in West Germany*. Philadelphia, 1987.

Keller, Thomas. *Deutsch-französische Dritte-Weg-Diskurse*. München, 2001.

Kennedy, Sean. *Reconciling France against Democracy*. Montreal, 2007.

Kessler, Nicolas. *Histoire politique de la Jeune Droite*. Paris, 2001.

Klemperer, Klemens von. *Ignaz Seipel*. Princeton, 1972.

Langner, Albrecht, ed. *Katholizismus, Wirtschaftsordnung und Sozialpolitik, 1945-1963*. Paderborn, 1980.

Le Crom, Jean-Pierre. *Syndicats, nous voilà!*. Paris, 1995.

Lieberman, Ben. *From Recovery to Catastrophe*. New York, 1998.

Lundestad, Geir. "Empire by Invitation? The United States and Western Europe, 1945-1952."

Journal of Peace Research (23) 1986. 263-77.

Lutz, Heinrich. *Demokratie im Zwielicht*. Munich, 1963.

Maier, Charles S. *Recasting Bourgeois Europe*. Princeton, 1975.

--. "The Two Postwar Eras and the Conditions for Stability in Twentieth-Century Western Europe," *The American Historical Review* (86) 1981. 327-52.

Milward, Alan. *The Reconstruction of Western Europe*. London, 1984.

Mirowski, Philip and Dieter Plehwe, eds. *The Road from Mont Pèlerin*. Cambridge, MA, 2009.

Misner, Paul. *Social Catholicism in Europe*. New York, 1991.

Mitchell, Timothy. "The Limits of the State," *American Political Science Review* (85) 1991. 77-96.

Munro, Gregory. *Hitler's Bavarian Antagonist*. Lewiston, 2006. .

Nicholls, A.J. *Freedom with Responsibility*. Oxford, 1994.

Nord, Philip. "Catholic Culture in Interwar France," *French Politics, Culture & Society* (21) 2003. 1-20.

--. *France's New Deal*. Princeton, 2010.

Ory, Pascal and Jean-François Sirinelli, *Les intellectuels en France, de l'affaire Dreyfus à nos jours*. Paris, 2002.

Patch, William. *Christian Trade Unions in the Weimar Republic*. New Haven, 1985.

Pedersen, Susan. *Family, Dependence, and the Origins of the Welfare State*. Cambridge, 1993.

Pelletier, Dennis. *Économie et Humanisme*. Paris, 1996.

Peter, Collette. *Charles Maurras et l'idéologie d'Action Française*. Paris, 1972.

Plaza, Arthur. *From Christian Militants to Republican Renovators: The Third* Ralliement *of Catholics in Postwar France, 1944-1965*. Ph.D. Dissertation. New York University, 2008.

Prévotat, Jacques. *Les Catholiques et l'Action française (1899-1939)*. Paris, 2001.

Prümm, Karl. *Walter Dirks und Eugen Kogon als katholische Publizisten der Weimarer Republik*. Heidelberg, 1984.

Rabinbach, Anson. *The Crisis of Austrian Socialism*. Chicago, 1983.

Rémond, René. *Les catholiques dans la France des années 30*. Paris, 1960.

Rodgers, Daniel. *Atlantic Crossings*. Cambridge, MA, 1998.

Schloesser, Stephen. *Jazz Age Catholicism*. Buffalo, 2005.

Seefried, Elke. *Reich und Stände*. Düsseldorf, 2006.

Smith, Helmut Walser. *German Nationalism and Religious Conflict*. Princeton, 1995.

Stegmann, Franz Josef. *Geschichte der sozialen Ideen im deutschen Katholizismus* in *Geschichte der sozialen Ideen in Deutschland*. Ed. Helga Grebing. München, 1969.

Sternhell, Ze'ev. *Neither Right nor Left*. Trans D. Maisel. Princeton, 1983.

Stevens, Jason W. *God-Fearing and Free*. Cambridge, MA, 2011.

Suval, Alfred. *The Anschluss Question in the Weimar Era*. Baltimore, 1974.

Sutton, Michael. *Nationalism, Positivism and Catholicism*. New York, 1982.

Judith F. Stone, *The Search for Social Peace*. Albany, 1985.

Tooze, J. Adam. *Statistics and the German State, 1900–1945*. New York, 2001.

Vayssière, Bertrand. *Vers une Europe fédérale?*. Brussels, 2006.

Ward, W.R. *The Holy See and Hitler's Germany*. 2007.,

Weber, Eugen. *Action Française*. Stanford, 1962.

Werner-Müller, Jan. *Contesting Democracy*. New Haven, 2011.

Whitney, Susan B. *Mobilizing Youth*. Durham, 2009.